



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### **A Neglected vetmbara Narrative Collection, Hemacandrasri Maladhrin's Upadeamlsvopajñavtti**

**Citation for published version:**

Dundas, P 2013, 'A Neglected vetmbara Narrative Collection, Hemacandrasri Maladhrin's Upadeamlsvopajñavtti: Part 1 (With an Appendix on the Funeral of Abhayadevasri Maladhrin)', *International Journal of Jaina Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1-47.  
<<http://www.soas.ac.uk/research/publications/journals/ijjs/file83323.pdf>>

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Published In:**

International Journal of Jaina Studies

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

CC-BY-NC-ND SOAS, University of London

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**A NEGLECTED ŚVETĀMBARA NARRATIVE COLLECTION**  
**HEMACANDRASŪRI MALADHĀRIN'S UPADEŚAMĀLĀSVOPAJÑAVṚTTI**  
**PART 1**  
**(WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE FUNERAL OF ABHAYADEVASŪRI MALADHĀRIN)**

Paul Dundas

Scholarly investigation into processes of canonisation in religious traditions has reached such a level of productivity in recent years that it may soon be necessary to establish a canon of outstanding works which discuss the formation of scriptural canons. Research on Jainism has readily acknowledged the interest of this subject, and valuable insights have been gained into the rationales informing the groupings and listings of constituent texts of a variety of Śvetāmbara canons which were introduced from around the middle of the first millennium CE and remained operative into modern times.<sup>1</sup> Also of great value has been the identification of practical canons, effectively curricula or syllabi of texts taken from a range of genres and historical contexts, which have provided modern Śvetāmbara renunciants and laypeople with a framework for gaining an informed understanding of the main parameters of Jain doctrine and practice of most direct concern to them.<sup>2</sup>

The historian of Śvetāmbara Jainism has an obvious obligation to be sensitive to the significance of established 'insider' versions of canons. Nonetheless, further possibilities remain for identifying informal Śvetāmbara textual groupings which would not readily fall under the standard canonical rubric of 'scriptural' or 'doctrinal'. In this respect I would consider as at least quasi-canonical the group of major Prakrit and Sanskrit novels or romances (*kathā* / *kahā*) highlighted by Christine Chojnacki, most notably Uddyotanasūri's *Kuvalayamālā* and Siddharṣi's *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakathā*, which were written between the seventh and twelfth centuries and whose status was confirmed by their being subsequently epitomised in summary form in the thirteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Here the principle governing the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Emmrich 2011 for a valuable survey.

<sup>2</sup> See Cort 2001 and 2004. No research seems to have been carried out into Digambara practical canons.

<sup>3</sup> See Chojnacki 2011. The other works identified by Chojnacki as having been subsequently epitomised are Haribhadra's *Samarāicccakahā*, Dhanapāla's *Tilakamañjarī*, Jineśvarasūri's *Nivvāṇalīlāvaī* and Devacandra's

selection of these richly imaginative works for epitomising seems to have been their perceived capacity to impart religious edification through entertainment. Simple aesthetic enjoyment would not normally be identified as a major conditioning factor of scriptural canon formation (and in truth is rarely invoked in any context relating to Jain literature and art), but, as Kermode has recently argued, pleasure (however that be defined) can be a singularly serviceable criterion for the establishment of a canon of works of literary imagination.<sup>4</sup>

The boundaries of canonicity in Jain literature may also be adjusted by retrieving unpublished works once held in high regard but which had for whatever reason disappeared from view (as most recently has been the case with the publication of the first editions of two important Prakrit narrative works, Vijayasimhasūri's *Bhuyanaṣuṇḍarīkahā* and Bhadreśvara's *Kahāvalī*)<sup>5</sup> and also by reintroducing published but underestimated texts into the ambit of scholarly evaluation. This paper is a preliminary attempt to expand the canon of significant Jain narrative works by drawing attention to a (largely) Prakrit collection to be found within Hemacandrasūri Maladhārin's auto-commentary (*svopajñavṛtti*) (subsequently epitomised) on his verse *prakaraṇa*, the *Upadeśamālā*, “Garland of Instruction”, also known as the *Puṣpamālā*, “Blossom Garland”,<sup>6</sup> which despite having been published over 75 years ago,<sup>7</sup> albeit in slightly flawed form,<sup>8</sup> has to all intents and purposes been ignored by scholarship.<sup>9</sup>

---

*Samtiṇāhacariya*. Such works came to be classified by later Śvetāmbara tradition under the highly flexible rubric of *āgama*. For theoretical observations on condensing texts, see Horster and Reitz 2010.

<sup>4</sup> See Kermode 2004: 15-31.

<sup>5</sup> The *Siribhuvanaṣuṇḍarīkahā* is a large-scale Prakrit work almost 9,000 verses in length written in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Its heroine, the *mahāsati* Bhuvanasundarī, does not seem to figure in the extensive later Śvetāmbara literature about heroic wives. See Kelting 2009. The *Kahāvalī* which dates from the 12<sup>th</sup> century is a major Prakrit narrative collection containing 306 stories. The significance of this work was already known to Jacobi whose copy of a fourteenth century palm-leaf manuscript was used by Brown for his study of the cycle of Kālaka narratives. See Brown 1938: 102-7.

<sup>6</sup> For these two titles and for editions of the verse *mūla*, see note 50 and see also at note 56 for Sādhusomagaṇin's epitomising *Laghuvṛtti*.

<sup>7</sup> Only one edition of the *Upadeśamālā* together with its auto-commentary seems to have been published. This appeared at Ratlām in 1936 under the auspices of the Ṛṣabhdev Keśarīmal Śvetāmbar Saṁsthā. The *pothī* title page does not mention an editor and it is only at the conclusion of the Sanskrit introduction that he is revealed as Muni Ānandasāgara, better known as Sāgarānandasūri, one of the most significant promulgators of printed editions of the Śvetāmbara scriptures in the last century. No reference is made to any manuscript on which the edition is based. Schubring 1944: 444f. describes two manuscripts of the *Upadeśamālā* with *svopajñavṛtti*. While the language of the verse *mūla* is identified by him as Prakrit, the auto-commentary is incorrectly described as being only in Sanskrit.

<sup>8</sup> See note 50.

Since Hemacandrasūri Maladhārin has remained a rather shadowy figure in scholarly discussions of this period, it may be useful first to review the sources relating to him and his writings.

## 1. Hemacandrasūri Maladhārin and his Background

A significant hindrance to the wider appreciation of the historical position of Hemacandrasūri Maladhārin (henceforth HM) is the fact that he can all too easily be confused with his homonymous younger contemporary Hemacandra (1087-1172), often known as Hemacandrācārya or Hemācārya, the court paṇḍit of the Caulukya monarchs Jayasiṃha Siddharāja and Kumārapāla, whose authoritative treatments of disparate subjects such as Jain legendary history, lay practice, poetics and Sanskrit grammar achieved a near normative status within the Śvetāmbara community and famously led to him being styled Kalikālasarvajña ('The Omniscient One of the Bad World Age'). Pioneering western scholars of Jainism were well aware of HM's significance in respect to both his own connection with Jayasiṃha Siddharāja<sup>10</sup> and the value of his commentary on Jinabhadra's *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*.<sup>11</sup> However, the occurrence of the simple designation 'Hemacandrasūri' in a work such as Jinaprabhasūri's *Vividhatīrthakalpa* does not facilitate immediate identification of this particular influential monk,<sup>12</sup> while the fact that HM's teacher Abhayadevasūri shared his name with the celebrated canonical commentator who flourished somewhat earlier has added further possible confusion.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Brief reference is made to this edition (without any mention of its editor) in the standard Hindi history of Jain literature, but no analysis or evaluation of the contents is provided beyond a skeletal outline of the topics discussed in the verse *mūla*. See Mahetā and Kāpaḍiyā 1968: 197.

<sup>10</sup> See Bühler 1936: 23. Bühler's original German study was published in 1889.

<sup>11</sup> See Leumann 2010: 87 (for HM as the "first Hemacandra") and 91-95. Leumann's original study was published in German in 1934, although based on research carried out much earlier.

<sup>12</sup> Jinaprabhasūri, *Vividhatīrthakalpa* p. 77 l.15. Cf. Chojnacki 1995 I: 438 n.8 where Jinaprabhasūri's mention of HM is explained by reference to Jhavery's account of the career of Hemacandra Kalikālasarvajña. The title page of Vairāgyarativijaya and Praśamarativijaya's 2004 edition of Sivaśarmasūri's *Bandhaśataka* names the author of the *vr̥tti* commentary simply as Hemacandrasūri.

<sup>13</sup> Jinaprabhasūri, *Vividhatīrthakalpa* p. 77 l.11. Cf. Chojnacki 1995 I: 437 n.3 where Abhayadevasūri Maladhārin is confused with the homonymous canonical commentator. Cf. Balbir 1993: 80.

This understandable uncertainty may be attributed to the fact that no developed hagiographical biographies (*carita*) of HM seems to exist in Śvetāmbara literature whereby this teacher's career could be projected into broader awareness and as a result the very dates of his life are conjectural; it seems to have largely coincided with that of Jayasiṃha Siddharāja (reigned 1094-1143), with HM's death most likely occurring between 1119 /1120 and 1134 / 1135.<sup>14</sup> No doubt as a result of this deficiency, modern scholars, whether monastic or lay, writing in Hindi and Gujarati tend to give only very sketchy accounts of HM's biography and offer little information beyond the fact that prior to his *dīkṣā* HM had been a royal minister called Pradyumna who had four wives.<sup>15</sup> While this can most likely be accepted as a trustworthy tradition since it derives from the *praśasti* to the commentary on the *Prākṛtadvyaśraya* by Rājaśekharaśūri, a monk lineally descended from HM,<sup>16</sup> it should be noted that this earliest source for HM's pre-*dīkṣā* identity dates from 1331, around two centuries after his death.<sup>17</sup>

HM himself produced a ten verse *praśasti* outlining the basic details of his teacher lineage which is reiterated at the conclusion of most of his works, namely his commentaries on the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, the *Bandhaśataka* of Śivaśarmaśūri and the *Jīvasamāsaprakaraṇa*, as well as in his auto-commentaries on the *Upadeśamālā* and *Bhavabhāvanā*. In the first three verses of this *praśasti* HM refers to an eminent teacher called Jayasiṃhasūri who belonged to the Harṣapurīya Gaccha which had emerged (*prasūta*) from the Praśnavāhana Kula. He then continues in the next six verses to describe in poetic terms Jayasiṃha's successor and his own teacher Abhayadevasūri, alluding in passing to some sort of connection (*samparka*) which he had with another monk, Municandrasūri, who is, however, not included in the lineage.<sup>18</sup>

The foregoing details, slightly exiguous though they may be, have the merit of deriving from HM himself. The location of the town of Harṣapura from which the

<sup>14</sup> See Sāgarmal Jain, *Upadeśamālāpuṣpamālā*, introduction p. 20. Tripāṭhī 1975: 326 refers to HM as Hemacandra Kalikālasarvajña's "junior contemporary". This judgement presumably refers to HM's supposed lesser significance.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Devendramuni Śāstrī 1985: 143, Śīlacandravijayagaṇi, *Jīvasamāsaprakaraṇa*, introduction p.8 and Tripuṭī Mahārāj 1950: 326.

<sup>16</sup> Sāgarmal Jain, *Upadeśamālāpuṣpamālā*, introduction p. 19 and note 37 below.

<sup>17</sup> Kāpaḍiyā 2004: 184.

<sup>18</sup> According to Kāpaḍiyā 2004: 184 Abhayadevasūri was a pupil of Municandrasūri; cf. Schubring 1944: 64 entry no. 149. However, Sāgarmal Jain, *Upadeśamālāpuṣpamālā*, introduction p.19, claims that he was a pupil of Jayasenasūri.

Harṣapurīya Gaccha took its name is not entirely certain, but it can be plausibly situated in the vicinity of modern Nāgaur in Rajasthan.<sup>19</sup> Significantly, no attempt is made by HM to locate Jayasiṃhasūri in a lineage of named teachers and his connections with his successor Abhayadevasūri are not defined with any precision. As for HM's invocation of the Praśnavāhana Kula, an ancient renunciant order mentioned in the *Kalpasūtra* as a subdivision of the Kauṭika Gaṇa,<sup>20</sup> this may represent an attempt to bypass an element of irregularity or uncertainty in Jayasiṃha's pupillary affiliation of a type not unknown at this particular period of Śvetāmbara Jain history by appropriating an essentially fictive lineage connection.<sup>21</sup> At any rate, the origins of the Harṣapurīya Gaccha were both murky and apparently outside the immediate confines of the Caulukya realm where the order's main teachers were later to flourish.<sup>22</sup>

HM's brief account of his predecessors can be significantly amplified by reference to his pupil Śrīcandrasūri's *praśasti* to his *Muṇisuvvayaṇimḍacariya* (vv. 10870-10995), a Prakrit *mahākāvya* describing the life of the twentieth Jina Munisuvrata.<sup>23</sup> This represents the main primary source for the early history of the Harṣapurīya Gaccha and the activities of HM and his teacher Abhayadevasūri. Śrīcandrasūri describes Jayasiṃhasūri as having been active

---

<sup>19</sup> See Jain 1972: 327f. This town was located within the realm of the Cauḥāns of Śākambharī who were devotees of Abhayadevasūri and HM. Sāgarmal Jain, *Upadeśamālāpuṣpamālā*, introduction p. 21, identifies Harṣapura with Hisār. I take this to be the town now located on the Rajasthan-Haryana border. See Dundas 2000: 238. Slightly less likely is the location of Harṣapura in north Gujarat, for which see Chojnacki 1995 I: 437 n. 5.

<sup>20</sup> *Kalpasūtra* p. 292. Rājaśekharaśūri describes himself in his *praśasti* to the *Prabandhakośa* as belonging to the Praśnavāhana Kula, Koṭika Gaṇa, Madhyama Śākhā and Harṣapurīya Gaccha. See Tripaṭhī 1975: 296.

<sup>21</sup> Compare, for example, the attempt by the early teachers of the Kharatara Gaccha to establish a formal relationship with the scriptural commentator Abhayadevasūri (first half of the 11<sup>th</sup> century) who in his writings had declared his lineage to be within the Candra Kula. For this Abhayadevasūri, see note 13.

<sup>22</sup> Rājaśekharaśūri in his commentary on the *Nyāyakandalī* identifies a teacher called Sthūlabhadra who was prior to Jayasiṃha in the lineage. See Tripaṭhī 1975: 297. In line with the lineage's desire to associate itself with the ancient Praśnavāhana Kula, this may be the famous elder (*sthavira*) Thūlabhadda / Sthūlabhadra mentioned at *Kalpasūtra* p. 287 who is reckoned to have lived around two centuries after Mahāvīra.

<sup>23</sup> The correct name of this author is Śrīcandrasūri. The Praākṛit and English title pages of Pagariya's edition refer to him respectively as 'Sirisiricaṃdasūri' and 'Śrī Candrasūri'. Cf. Tripaṭhī 1975: 195. By Śrīcandrasūri's own account his poem was inspired by a visit to the Bhṛgukacchajinabhavana shrine to Munisuvrata at Dhavalakka (mod. Dholkā), a simulacrum of the celebrated temple known as the Śakunikāvihāra of the Aśvāvabodhatīrtha at Bhṛgukaccha (modern Broach) with which Abhayadevasūri had close connections. See Śrīcandrasūri's *praśasti* v.10903 and cf. Krause 1999: 349.

as a paragon of moral behaviour in the region (*maṇḍala*) of Sayambharī,<sup>24</sup> which is to say Śākambharī (modern Sāmbhar) in the area of Ajmer, a location which would support the identification of Harṣapura mentioned above. However, it is his successor Abhayadevasūri who is portrayed as having provided the main preceptorial impetus to the lineage which Jayasiṃhasūri had in some way initiated.<sup>25</sup> The high status of this monk, whose social background is undefined, is conveyed by Śrīcandrasūri as being based on an intense austerity whereby his freedom from any sort of desire was demonstrable by the fact that the filth caked on his body and robes seemed to be the dirt of his karma emerging from within.<sup>26</sup> Abhayadevasūri's promotion of temple expansion and renovation extended from Gopālagiri (modern Gwalior) to Bhṛgukaccha (vv. 10903-10904) and beyond to Śrīpura (modern Sirpur in Maharashtra),<sup>27</sup> and his connection with local rulers, including Pṛthivīrāja of Śākambharī (v. 10905) ensured that his funeral in Pātāṇ, of which Śrīcandrasūri gives an invaluable firsthand account,<sup>28</sup> was a major event, witnessed by king Jayasiṃha Siddharāja himself.

Śrīcandrasūri's states only cursorily that HM succeeded to the rank of *ācārya*;<sup>29</sup> he does not specifically describe him as being the pupil of Abhayadevasūri nor does he present his promotion as having been in any way formally validated by monks or lay patrons. No reference is made to his pre-renunciant social background. Instead, after very general mention of HM's intensive course of study and his spreading of Jainism among local rulers and other prominent people (v. 10935-36), Śrīcandrasūri gives an important description, of relevance

---

<sup>24</sup> v. 10874a: *siriJayasiṃho sūri Sayambharī[-]maṇḍalammi supasiddho / paṃcavihāyārasamāyaraṇarao guṇaṇihī jāo*.

<sup>25</sup> Rājaśekharaśūri's *Sūrimantrāṇīyakaḥ*, pp. 1-8, provides the authoritative version of the *sūrimantra* of the Maladhārīya Gaccha (for this designation see below) which he describes as having been transmitted in 229 syllables by Abhayadevasūri: that is, without any reference to any ancient teachers or to Jayasiṃhasūri. See p. 7a l.8: *śrīAbhayadevasūrikramāgataṃ [sic] ekonatrimśadadhikaṃ śatadvayīmitākṣaram gurūṇāṃ dattaṃ mantram japet*. Śrīcandrasūri does not describe Abhayadevasūri transmitting this mantra to his successor HM.

<sup>26</sup> v. 10885: *dehe vatthesu sayā vi jassa malanivaham uvvahaṃtassa / abbhiṃtarakammamalo tabbhayabhō vvaṇīharai*.

<sup>27</sup> Śrīcandrasūri describes (v. 10904) how in the wake of gold pinnacles being fitted at Abhayadevasūri's behest to the Śakunikāvihāra at Bhṛgukaccha Jayasiṃha Siddharāja proclaimed a temporary ban on the killing of animals (*amāri*) throughout his kingdom. Cf. Dhaky & Moorti 2001: 17.

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix.

<sup>29</sup> v. 10933b: *tatto sūri siriHemacāṇdo tti*.

for some of the stories found in his *Upadeśamālā* auto-commentary, of his expounding of Siddharṣi's allegorical novel of 906CE, the *Upamitabhavaprapaṇcākathā*.<sup>30</sup>

“HM's quality of voice was resonant as a fresh stormcloud's thunder. Whenever he preached a sermon, people could hear his clear diction although they might be standing outside the temple. He possessed the gift of explication and when he was expounding a text even dullwitted people could gain an understanding of it. Siddharṣi the commentator<sup>31</sup> had once composed an inspirational narrative called the *Upamitabhavaprapaṇcā*. As a rule nobody had expounded it in public for a long time because it was a difficult work, but whenever HM interpreted its meaning even naïve people managed to grasp it. Since he had fully absorbed the sense of that work, he was invited to preach upon it, which he did continually for three years. From that day on the work circulated almost everywhere.”

Śrīcandrasūri goes on to enumerate HM's works (see next section) and then describes (vv. 10947-55) his close relationship with Jayasiṃha Siddharāja who attended his sermons and engaged him in discussion. The most dramatic incident in HM's life, recounted in some detail by Śrīcandrasūri (vv. 10964-10976, was his intercession with Khaṃgāra, described as the ruler (*pahu*) of Saurāṣṭra but most likely a local Bhilla chieftain,<sup>32</sup> who had held to ransom a large

---

<sup>30</sup> vv. 10937-10942a:

*navajalahargahirasare dhamuvaesaṃ ca diṃtae/  
jammi jīṇabhavaṇṇu bahimmi vi ṭhio jaṇo suṇai phuḍasaddaṃ //  
vakkhāṇaladdhiutte jammi kuṇaṃtammi satthavakkhāṇaṃ /  
pāeṇa jaḍamaṇaṃ vi jaṇāṇa boho samuppanno //  
Upamiyabhavappapaṃcā veraggakarī kahā kayā āsi /  
vakkhāṇiyaSiddheṇaṃ jā puvvaṃ sā kaḍhora tti //  
vakkhāṇiyā sahāe pāeṇa na keṇā ciraṃ kālāṃ /  
jassa muhaniggayatthā muddhāṇa vi sā taha kahaṃ ci //  
jāyā hiyayagayatthā abbattheuṇa tehiṃ jaha esā /  
uvaruvari tinnī varise nisuyā tasseva ya muhāo //  
taddiṇapabhiipayāro jāo pāeṇa tīe savvattha /*

<sup>31</sup> Siddharṣi wrote a famous commentary on Dharmadāsa's *Upadeśamālā*. See section 2.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Tripuṭī Mahārāj 1950: 328f. It is unclear whether Khaṃgāra ('sword-bearer'; see Lavani 1998: 529) is an epithet or the eponymous progenitor of a clan which was later to claim Rajput origins. According to Jinaprabhasūri, *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 9 l.22, Jayasiṃha killed the Khaṃgāra king / King Khaṃgāra (*khaṃgārarāya*), no doubt in partial retribution for his obstruction of the Jain pilgrimage. Cort 1990: 257 takes Khaṃgāra here as a personal name. Cf. Dhaky 2012: 70. Jinavijaya's edition of Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 65 ll.5 and 10, gives the name of this king as Ṣaṃgāra. The Khamgars are now a



and wealthy Jain pilgrimage party en route to the holy mountains of Gīrnār and Śātruñjaya.<sup>33</sup> HM's death occurred after a seven day fast and his funeral, which unlike that of Abhayadevasūri is not described in detail, was attended by Jayasiṃha Siddharāja.<sup>34</sup> No dating for any of these events is provided.

Śrīcandrasūri's *praśasti* to the *Muṇisuvvayasāmicariya* presents a picture of a highly public teacher who, unlike most other prominent monks of the period, is not hagiographically connected with miracle working or sectarian debate. It is noteworthy that Śrīcandrasūri refers to neither HM nor his teacher Abhayadevasūri by the encomiastic epithet '*maladhārin*', 'filthy'. Later sources differ as to which Caulukya monarch bestowed this title (*biruda*) on Abhayadevasūri, with Rājaśekharaśūri (in two of his works) and Padmadeva claiming it was Karṇa (1064-1094),<sup>35</sup> while Jinaprabhasūri in a preamble to an account of HM's association with the founding of the KokāPārśvanātha temple in Pāṭaṇ has Karṇa's successor Jayasiṃha conferring the *biruda*.<sup>36</sup> Rājaśekharaśūri produced a codification of the *sūrimantra* of his lineage which he styles the Maladhārīya Gaccha rather than the Harṣapurīya Gaccha,<sup>37</sup> the designation favoured by HM himself and Śrīcandrasūri, and it may be that the assigning of the epithet '*maladhārin*' to the earlier teachers and the order in general, not to mention the promulgation of traditions about the involvement of Karṇa and Jayasiṃha, did not take place until the second half of the thirteenth century.

Further interpretation of HM's career must be equally speculative. The sources described above do not make any reference to contemporary Jain monks belonging to other Śvetāmbara lineages, although the period in question, roughly the last decades of the eleventh

---

landholding caste; those resident in Rajasthan claim that their ancestral home was Jūṇāgaḍh in Gujarat. See Singh 1998: 1685. Jinaprabhasūri gives Khaṇḡāragadha as one of the names of Juṇṇadugga (~ mod. Jūṇāgaḍh). See Chojnacki, 1995 I: 147, 1995 II: 175 for Khaṇḡāradurga as a name of Jūṇāgaḍh.

<sup>33</sup> Although Khaṇḡāra's motives are ascribed to greed rather than any religious bias, this interference with the progress of a Jain pilgrimage is noteworthy evidence that such behaviour was not introduced to Gujarat by later Muslim rulers.

<sup>34</sup> See Appendix.

<sup>35</sup> Tripuṭī Mahārāj 1950: 324 n.

<sup>36</sup> See Chojnacki 1995 I: 437 and Cort 1998: 90.

<sup>37</sup> However, see note 25 for Rājaśekharaśūri connecting himself with the Harṣapurīya Gaccha. For the full lineage of the Maladhārīya Gaccha prior to Rājaśekharaśūri, see Naracandrasūri, *Kathāratnasāgara*, introduction p.5. It is not uncommon to find the epithet from which the order derived this name spelt as '*malladhārin*'. See, for example, Devendramuni Śāstrī 1985: 143f. For inscriptional references attesting to the existence of the Maladhārī Gaccha into the 16<sup>th</sup> century, see Chojnacki 1995 I: 437 n.6.

century and the first half of the twelfth, was one in which a large number of disciplinary orders jostled for space in the Caulukya kingdom. However, Phyllis Granoff has drawn attention to a possible polemical reference to HM by his contemporary Jinadattasūri (1076-1155), one of the early teachers of the order which came to be known as the Kharatara Gaccha.<sup>38</sup> In v. 18 of his *Apabhraṃśa rās*, the *Upadeśarasāyana*, “Elixir of Instruction”, Jinadattasūri states:<sup>39</sup> “He carries out all sorts of fasts including those of the half month and four month periods. He bears his internal dirt externally. (However), he expounds teachings contrary to the scriptures and correct practice which relate to the performance of the ceremonies of repentance (*pratikramaṇa*) and homage to the teacher (*vandanaka*).”<sup>40</sup> While the similarity to Śrīcandrasūri's description of the results of Abhayadevasūri's austerity is striking (see above), that particular teacher does not appear to have left any writings setting forth doctrinal positions which might facilitate the identification of him as the subject of this verse. Granoff suggests that HM may have possibly roused Jinadattasūri's antipathy through blocking his access to patronage and that it is he who is the individual referred to in the *Upadeśarasāyana*.<sup>41</sup>

Some refinement of interpretation can be made here. In commenting on *Upadeśarasāyana* v. 18 Jinapāla (13<sup>th</sup> century) expands on the filthy monk's delinquency in respect to ritual by invoking four of his supposedly deviant positions, the first of which was that laymen should not perform *pratikramaṇa*, the ritualised ceremony of repentance.<sup>42</sup> He

---

<sup>38</sup> Granoff 1992: 41 and 49. Granoff refers (p. 74 n.17) to later tradition which describes Jinadattasūri having to flee on a camel after being chastised by a teacher named as Hemācārya whom she suggests might be HM rather than Hemacandra Kalikālasarvajña. The nickname *auṣṭrika*, 'camel rider' was regularly used by opponents of both Jinadattasūri and the Kharatara Gaccha. This term, hardly common in Sanskrit or in its Prakrit form *uṭṭhiya*, appears tantalisingly in HM's commentary on *Anuyogadvārasūtra* sū. 40 p. 90, but there in fact it refers to camel's wool.

<sup>39</sup> *addhamāsa caumāsai pārai malum abbhīmtaru bāhiri dhārai / kahai ussuttaummaggapayāim paḍikkamaṇayavaṇḍaṇayagayāim*. Granoff numbers this as v. 17.

<sup>40</sup> My translation.

<sup>41</sup> The tradition that HM was a minister has been referred to above. His pupil Śrīcandrasūri was a finance minister of Jayasimha Siddharāja (see Pagariya's introduction to his edition of Śrīcandrasūri's *Muṇisuvvayajīṇḍacariya*, p. 7) which might suggest that the leadership of the Harṣapuṇḍiya Gaccha came from an élite social background as opposed to Jinadattasūri whose origins were in a mercantile caste.

<sup>42</sup> The other three positions relate to aspects of worship: monks and others (*sādhvādibhiḥ*) should not praise tutelary deities when the *kāyotsarga* observance is being performed (*kṣetradevatādikāyotsarga*) in the course of *pratikramaṇa*, that immediately after recitation of the three hymns (*tristuti*) it is inappropriate to recite the Śakrastava liturgy and that nuns on standing up should perform a complete act of homage (*dvādaśāvartavandana*). In commenting on *Upadeśarasāyana* vv. 19-20 Jinapāla refers further to the “filthy” monk (v.19 commentary: *malādidhāraka*; v.20 commentary: *maladhārin*).

then adduces (*Upadeśarasāyana* v. 19 comm.) a short quotation ascribed to the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, namely *samaṇeṇa sāvaṇeṇa ya*, 'by monk and layman'. This is the opening of v. 3 of sūtra 29 of the *Anuyogadvārasūtra* which stipulates that the *āvaśyaka* ritual, of which *pratikramaṇa* is an integral part, should be performed twice daily by both monk and layman.<sup>43</sup> Jinapāla's citation of this is without further explanation but may well be pointed since HM produced a commentary on the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*. However, it is unclear just how much should be read into the fact that HM does not directly reproduce the word '*sāvaṇeṇa*' in his commentary on this passage, providing instead the Sanskrit wording *śramaṇādibhiḥ*, "by monks etc." and *śramaṇādinā*, "by the monk etc."<sup>44</sup> The restriction of the performance of *pratikramaṇa* to renunciants alone would have been radical even at a time when some Śvetāmbara disciplinary orders were insisting on a return to supposedly purer forms of practice and there is nothing easily identifiable elsewhere in HM's writings to connect him with such a stance.<sup>45</sup>

It is possible that there was a different dimension to HM's practice which might have caused Jinadattasūri to excoriate him. The long period of time which according to Śricandrasūri (see above) HM spent expounding the *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcākathā*, apparently in a temple rather than more acceptably in a community hall (*upāśraya*) at irregular intervals, could have provoked the criticism that he was straying a little too close to the behaviour of the domesticated temple-dwelling (*caityavāsin*) monks of whom Jinadattasūri and other teachers of his order were implacable opponents. However, HM's statement at *Upadeśamālā* v. 21<sup>46</sup> that even an inadequate monk can purify his karma and so facilitate the gaining of awakening

---

<sup>43</sup> *samaṇeṇa sāvaṇeṇa ya āvassakāyavvayaṃ havati jamhā / aṃto aho-nisissa u tamhā āvassayaṃ nāma*. I reproduce Muni Jambūvijaya's editorial punctuation

<sup>44</sup> HM on *Anuyogadvārasūtra* sū. 29 v. 3 p. 81 ll. 11 and 23.

<sup>45</sup> Jinapāla may here be drawing attention to HM's position concerning the validity of a lay *pratikramaṇa-sūtra*, a subject which was controversial in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. See Dundas 2011: 337.

<sup>46</sup> *osanno 'vi vihāre kammaṃ soheṇi sulabhabohī ya / caraṇakaraṇam visuddham uvavūhaṃto parūvaṃto*. In his auto-commentary on this verse, pp. 67-68, HM quotes fourteen Prakrit verses which he ascribes to the *Piṇḍaniryukti*. The first three of these verses correspond to *Piṇḍaniryukti* vv. 292-94 (with slight variants for 293 and 294), but the others are not identifiable as belonging to this work and do not appear to be stylistically connected with it. The fact that Sādhūsomagaṇin renders them into Sanskrit in his *Laghuvṛtti* (see below) suggests that they derive from another source.

which might be taken as condoning lax renunciant behaviour is in fact a quotation from the *Ācārāṅgacūṛṇi*.<sup>47</sup>

## 2. HM's *Upadeśamālāsvopajñavṛtti* and its Chronological Location within his Works

At the conclusion of the *Upadeśamālā* (henceforth UM) HM styles the work as a *prakaraṇa* (v. 500). This 'particular type of small treatise' (*laghuśāstraviśeṣa*)<sup>48</sup> was an increasingly significant Śvetāmbara literary genre in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, being typically structured around a description of Jainism's central doctrinal tenets and their sub-categories supported by technical discussions deriving from *āgama* and often employing embedded illustrative narratives.<sup>49</sup> The UM,<sup>50</sup> which consists of around 505 verses in Māhārāṣṭrī

---

<sup>47</sup> *Jaina Uddharaṇa Kośa*, entry 1822. Merutuṅga, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 57, describes Jayasīṃha Siddharāja's minister Sāntū paying homage in the temple which he himself had founded to a *caityavāsin* monk who lived there with a concubine (*vāraveśyā*). This monk, filled with remorse, then took proper renunciant initiation from HM.

<sup>48</sup> This definition is given by Vardhamānasūri, *Dharmaratnakaraṇḍaka* p. 3.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Dundas 2008: 110 and Kāpaḍiyā and Mahetā 1968: 192-202. While a *prakaraṇa* such as the UM might have as its subject-matter the renunciant regime, there is evidence that laymen were permitted to explicate works of this sort. Cf. Jinadattasūri, *Sandehadolāvalī* v. 75 p. 98: *sugurūṇaṃ ca vihāro jattha na desammi jāyae kaha vi / payaraṇaviyārakusalo susāvago atthi tā kahau* ("If a teacher is not in the area and there is a layman well versed in *prakaraṇas*, then he can be permitted to expound the text").

<sup>50</sup> The earliest edition of the UM was published in Mahesānā in 1911 under the auspices of the Jain Śreyaskar Maṇḍal. See Mahetā and Kāpaḍiyā 1968: 197 n.1. I have not had access to this. There are two recent editions, by Pradyumnasūri and Śāh under the title *Puṣpamālāprakaraṇa* (with Gujarati translation), and, under the title *Upadeśapuṣpamālā*, by Sāgarmal Jain (with Hindi translation). The former also provides an alphabetical index of the verses and short Gujarati summaries of a selection of the illustrative narratives. Neither edition includes any information about manuscripts or provides any analysis or philological discussion. The overall structure of the UM is provided by the 'door' (*dvāra*) analogy, a standard hermeneutic procedure of Śvetāmbara scholasticism (in terms of canonical texts most notably in the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*), to signal transitions of topic. The work's doctrinal framework is built around basic categories: *ahiṃsā* and knowledge along with the standard fourfold classification of the Jain religion into liberality (*dāṇa*), morality (*sīla*), austerity (*taṇa*) and inner disposition (*bhāva*). This generates a discussion of correct belief (*sammaddaṃsaṇa*), subsequently more narrowly dealt with as purity of behaviour (*caraṇavisuddhī*) which is then bifurcated into an analysis of the two main ascetic preoccupations, conquest of the senses and conquest of the passions. Both of these generalised forms of restraint are narrowed down to a description of the renunciant regime further disaggregated into nine categories: being the pupil of an appropriate teacher (*gurukulavāsa*), confession (*āloyaṇā*), disciplined deportment (*viṇaya*), care for fellow renunciants (*veyāvacca*), study (*sajjhāya*), avoidance of inappropriate places of worship (*aṇāyataṇavajjaṇa*), cessation from argumentative dispute (*parivādanṇvīṭṭi*), firmness in the doctrine (*dhammattheriya* and final knowledge (*pariṇṇāṇa*). The work concludes with an account of the 'wise death' (*paṇḍitamaraṇa*) of *sallekhanā*, the bliss of salvation and the necessity of striving to destroy karma. Cf. Mahetā & Kāpaḍiyā 1968: 197.

Prakrit,<sup>51</sup> belongs to a notable subgenre of Śvetāmbara didactic works which incorporate the word *upadeśa* / *uvaesa*, “instruction”, in their titles. The prototype for these seems to have been Dharmadāsa's *Upadeśamālā* which dates from around the fifth or sixth centuries CE. That this particular work was the specific inspiration behind HM's own *Upadeśamālā* is feasible but unprovable.<sup>52</sup> However, the fact that Siddharṣi, the author of the *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakathā*, produced a commentary on Dharmadāsa's work is probably relevant, given HM's public relationship with this celebrated allegorical novel as described by Śrīcandrasūri (see above). Indeed, HM invokes the *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakathā* in v. 8 of his *maṅgala* to the UM as providing a key to or interpretive template for the various allegories which he includes among his own illustrative narratives.<sup>53</sup> Whether and to what extent HM's UM had become confused with that of Dharmadāsa is unclear, but it seems that by around the thirteenth century it had come to be designated the *Puṣpamālā*, “Blossom Garland”, by way of differentiation from the earlier homonymous work.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, on this basis Sāgarmal Jain has recently proposed renaming the work the '*Upadeśapuṣpamālā*'. Although this designation is no doubt slightly cumbersome, it does reflect the fact that while *Puṣpamālā* may be a

---

<sup>51</sup> Anandasāgara's 1936 edition of the UM and auto-commentary has 505 verses, as does Pradyumnasūri and Śāh's edition. The UM is described by Mahetā and Kāpaḍiyā 1968: 196f. as consisting of 505 verses. *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library* 2006 II: 381f. nos. 536-537 refers to a manuscript of the UM containing 505 verses, although it shows no awareness that the work has been published. However, Sāgarmal Jain's edition has only 501 verses, as does the epitomising version by the 15<sup>th</sup> century Sādhusomagaṇin. I do not provide a concordance since the main concern of this paper is HM's auto-commentary. However, the following points can be noted. The enumeration of verses in Ānandasāgara's edition is at times chaotic, in particular between vv. 233 and 290 and 345 and 352. This edition also omits a verse found in the other versions (Sādhusomagaṇin v. 202, Pradyumnasūri and Śāh v. 205 and Sāgarmal Jain v. 201). Pradyumnasūri and Śāh's edition includes four verses (vv. 164-67) not found in the other versions of the UM. However, they occur in HM's auto-commentary on UM v. 163 p. 350 where they are said to be “for the benefit women and children” (*strībālopakāranimittam*). They are followed by four Sanskrit verses, described as occurring “in the lawbook of the brahmans” (*brahmaṇṇāṇām smṛtau*), which correspond exactly to the Prakrit verses. Some of the UM verses are taken from other sources. A systematic investigation remains to be carried out (no help is given by any of the published editions), but the following may be noted at this stage: UM v. 17 = *Āvaśyakaniryukti* v. 1; UM v. 223 ~ Haribhadra, *Pañcavastuka* v. 172 (HM has *jao bhaṇio* for *jao 'vassam*); UM v. 225 = *Oghaniryukti* v. 760; UM v. 226 (correcting enumeration in the 1936 edition) is found in several places in the commentarial literature; see *Jain Uddharaṇa Kośa*, entry 3285. See also note 46.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Kāpaḍiyā & Mahetā 1968: 192-202. Among the many editions of Dharmadāsa's *Upadeśamālā* that by Tessitori 1912/2000: 77-275 is particularly useful.

<sup>53</sup> I propose to discuss these in the forthcoming second part of this paper, adducing HM's other allegorical narratives in the auto-commentary on his *Bhavabhāvanā*.

<sup>54</sup> At UM v.2 HM refers to his work as a 'fine garland of flowers' (*varakusumamālaṃ*).

secondary title it is one which has gained a degree of currency.<sup>55</sup> It was certainly the title by which the *prakaraṇa* was known to Sādhusomagaṇin of the Kharatara Gaccha whose *Laghuvṛtti*, an epitomising version of HM's auto-commentary written in 1456, makes clear the respect in which the work was viewed at a later period.<sup>56</sup>

The UM refers throughout to narratives which are only identifiable by reference to its auto-commentary, from which it may be concluded that this was produced by HM very soon after the root verses, if not in immediate conjunction with them. However, no date of composition for the root verses and the auto-commentary is available in a *praśasti* and an inspection of the relevant sources raises some difficulties in respect to locating these works precisely. In the *praśasti* to the *Muṇisuvvayajīṇīṇḍacariya* (vv. 10943-10946) Śrīcandrasūri gives a brief identification of HM's works. According to this, HM first composed (*kāūṇa*) the root verses (*sutta*) of the two *prakaraṇas*, the UM and *Bhavabhāvanā*, and then produced (*kayā*) commentaries (*vittī*) upon them. The next texts to be mentioned by Śrīcandrasūri are commentaries (*vittī*) on the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, the *Jīvasāmāsaprakaraṇa* and the *Bandhaśatakaprakaraṇa*. HM is then described as having composed (*raiyaṃ*) a *ṭippanaka* explication intended to elucidate difficult points (*visamaṭṭhāṇāvabohayaraṃ*) on the commentary on the *Mūlāvassaya* (that is to say, Haribhadra's commentary on the *Āvaśyaka Nirvyukti*).<sup>57</sup> The last text to be mentioned is an extensive (*savittharā*) and clear (*phuḍatthā*) commentary composed (*raiya*) on Jinabhadra's *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*.

Śrīcandrasūri does not state whether this account, given without dates, reflects the exact chronological order of composition of HM's works, but there is no doubt that it is incomplete since it omits any mention of the (now lost) *Nandiṭṭippanaka*.<sup>58</sup> This work is referred to in HM's *praśasti* to his commentary on the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* which he describes himself as having written during the reign of Jayasimha Siddharāja in saṃvat 1175,

<sup>55</sup> Compare the title page of Ānandasāgara's 1936 edition where the work is named *ŚrīUpadeśamālā* (*Puṣpamālāparābhīdhā*), and the heading on p. 1 where it is named *Puṣpamālā Upadeśamālāparābhīdhānā*. For the Prakrit title *Upadesamālā-Pupphamālāpagaraṇa* and the auto-commentary designated as *Pupphamālā svopajñāvṛtti*, see Tripuṭi Mahārāj 1950: 329.

<sup>56</sup> See v. 7b of Sādhusomagaṇin's *praśasti*: *sādhur vṛttim akārṣīṇ madhukara iva puṣpamālāyāḥ*. Vinayasāgar 2006:126, entry1660 gives the designation of this monk as Sādhusomopādhyāya. Sādhusomagaṇin offers condensed Sanskrit renderings of the Prakrit narratives and summarises the intervening doctrinal material in order, so he rather condescendingly puts it, “to please those of little taste” (*alparucituṣṭyaī*).

<sup>57</sup> The title of the published edition is *Hāribhadrīyāvaśyakavṛttiṭippanaka*.

<sup>58</sup> Muni Jambūvijaya, *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, introduction p. 50, refers to Muni Puṇyavijaya's mention of Śrīcandrasūri's “remarkable” (*āścarya kī bāt*) failure to mention the *Nandiṭṭippanaka*. Schubring 1944: 210 entry no. 413 refers to a *Dipālikākālpa* with *ṭabo* by HM for which I can find no reference elsewhere.

that is 1118 / 1119 CE,<sup>59</sup> and this does indeed seem to have been his last work as its location in Śrīcandrasūri's enumeration would suggest. The *praśasti* is couched in first person terms<sup>60</sup> whereby in what is clearly a reference to Abhayadevasūri HM recounts how he heard the teaching of a great man (*paramapuruṣasyopadeśam*) and then quickly (*jhaṭiti*) composed his *Āvaśyakaṭippaṇaka* which he attached to the treasure chest of correct reflection (*sadbhāvanāmañjūṣā*) as a fresh protective cover (*nūtanaphalaka*).<sup>61</sup> HM then enumerates the rest of the works written by him in the following order: the *Bandhaśatakaprakaraṇa* commentary, the *Anuyogadvārasūtra* commentary, the UM verses (*sūtra*), the commentary (*vr̥tti*) on these, the *Jīvasamāsaprakaraṇa* commentary (*vivaraṇa*), the *Bhavabhāvanā* verses (*sūtra*), the commentary (*vivaraṇa*) on these and then the *Nandiṭippaṇaka*, which HM describes as being a novel and solid part (*aṅga*) of the treasure chest. HM goes on to assert that by adding all these improvements the aforementioned chest assumed a diamond-hard appearance and so became beyond the reach of malicious people. But then, he claims, these people began to destroy the chest's folding lid (*taddvārapāṭasamputam*) by hammering on it with falsehood (*chala*).<sup>62</sup> So HM in agitation carefully considered a means of counteracting

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Balbir 1993: 80, Kāpaḍiā 2004: 184 and Mahetā 1989: 414. Mette 2010: 142-44 and 349-51 translates and annotates a story from HM's *Viśeṣāvaśyabhāṣya* commentary. However, the work is dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century (p. 350).

<sup>60</sup> *tato mayā tasya paramapuruṣasyopadeśam śrutvā viracayya jhaṭiti niveśitam Āvaśyakaṭippaṇakābhīdhānam sadbhāvanāmañjūṣāyāṃ nūtanaphalakam, tato 'param api Śatakavivaraṇanāmakam, anyad api Anuyogadvāravṛttisamjñitam, tato 'param Upadeśamālāsūtrābhīdhānam, aparaṃ tu tadvṛttināmakam, anyac ca Jīvasamāsavivaraṇanāmadheyam, anyat tu Bhavabhāvanāsūtrasamjñitam, aparaṃ tu tadvivaraṇanāmakam, anyac ca jhaṭiti viracayya tasyāḥ sadbhāvanāmañjūṣāyā aṅgabhūtaṃ niveśitam Nandiṭippaṇakanāmadheyam nūtanadr̥ḍhaphalakam | etaiś ca nūtanaphalakair niveśitair vajramayīva samjñatā 'sau mañjūṣā teṣāṃ pāpānām agamyā | tatas tair atīvacchalaghātītayā saṃcūrṇayitum ārabdham tad dvārapāṭasamputam | tato mayā sasam̐bhrameṇa nipuṇaṃ tatpratīvidhānopāyaṃ cintayitvā viracayitum ārabdham taddvārapīdhānahetor Viśeṣāvaśyakavivaraṇābhīdhānam vajramayam iva nūtanakapāṭasamputam | tataś c' ĀbhayakumāragaṇiDhanadevagaṇiJinabhadragaṇiLakṣmaṇagaṇiVibudhacandrādīmunivṛndaśrīMahānanda śrīmahattarāVīramatīgaṇinīyādisāhāyyād 're re niścitam idānīm hatā vayaṃ yady etan niṣpadyate, tato dhāvata dhāvata gr̥hṇīta gr̥hṇīta lagata lagata' ityādi pūtkurvātām sarvātmaśaktyā praharatām hāhāravāṃ kurvātām ca mohādicaraṭānām cirāt katham api viracayya taddvāre niveśitam etad iti.* Text from the conclusion to HM's commentary on the *Viśeṣāvaśyabhāṣya* taken from Muni Jambūvijaya, *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, introduction p. 50. For partial quotations, cf. Śīvaśarmasūri, *Bandhaśatakaprakaraṇa*, introduction p. 13 and HM's *Bhavabhāvanā*, introduction p. 71.

<sup>61</sup> HM employs the same comparison of Jain texts to a store chest or casket as the sixteenth century Tapā Gaccha polemicist Dharmasāgara. See Dundas 2007: 73. However, whereas Dharmasāgara viewed the casket as impossible to open without the key of scriptural commentary, HM presents his exegetical work as sealing and protecting the casket from external threat.

<sup>62</sup> While it is possible that HM is here referring to teachers belonging to rival Śvetāmbara disciplinary orders, he may also be alluding to the Digambaras who in his time still had a degree of influence in Gujarat.

this and began to compose his commentary on the *Viśeṣāvaśyabhāṣya* which became the equivalent of a new adamantine lid for safeguarding the treasure chest. HM recounts graphically how some monks and nuns who were close to him urged him on in his task so that he eventually managed to complete the work and seriously disconcert King Delusion and his evil confederates.<sup>63</sup>

Leaving aside HM's lively description of the context of his writings, which is suggestive of a period of intense dispute, and the use of allegory to characterise his achievement, the cumulative structure of his account (*tato 'param...aparam tu...anyac ca...anyat tu...aparam tu...anyac ca...tataḥ*) seems to describe the chronological sequence of his works culminating in the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* commentary of 1118 / 1119 CE. However, no specific dates are provided and when information from other sources is adduced, the chronological context becomes rather more uncertain. So the colophon to HM's *Jīvasamāsaprakaraṇavṛtti* states that this particular work was composed in Pāṭaṇ during the reign of Jayasiṃha Siddharāja in saṃvat 1165, that is 1108 / 1109 CE,<sup>64</sup> while the early manuscript catalogue, the *Brhaṭṭippanikā*, gives a date of saṃvat 1175, that is 1118 / 1119 CE, for the auto-commentary on the UM.<sup>65</sup> However, the *Bhavabhāvanā* and its auto-commentary are listed in the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣyavṛtti praśasti* after the UM and its auto-commentary, while the *praśasti* to the *Bhavabhāvanā* commentary states (v.11) that this work was composed in saṃvat 1170, that is 1113 / 1114 CE. Furthermore, the *Bhavabhāvanā* is aware of the UM since it refers to this work at the very beginning of its Prakrit *maṅgala* verses, although it is unclear whether this reference encompasses the auto-commentary.<sup>66</sup>

There is a further piece of relevant internal evidence. HM states that one of the stories in his UM auto-commentary is an abbreviation of a more extended version found in the

---

<sup>63</sup> King Delusion plays an important role in many of HM's allegorical narratives in both the UM and *Bhavabhāvanā* auto-commentaries. See the forthcoming second part of this paper.

<sup>64</sup> See the conclusion to Śīlacandravijaya's edition of the *Jīvasamāsaprakaraṇa* with HM's *vṛtti*, p. 240: *saṃvat 1165 Caitra śudi 5 Some 'dyeha śrīmadAṇahilapāṭake samastarājāvalīvirājītamahārājādhirājaparamēśvara-śrīmajJayasiṃhadeva[-]kalyāṇavijayarājye evaṃkāle pravarttamāne.....paṇḍita-śvetāmbarācārya-bhaṭṭāraka-śrīHemacandrācāryeṇa pustikā li.li.*

<sup>65</sup> Mahetā & Kāpaḍiyā 1968: 197. Tripuṭī Mahārāj 1950: 329f. lists the UM and the auto-commentary without any dating as the fourth and fifth of HM's works, with the *Jīvasamāsaprakaraṇa* commentary (dated to saṃvat 1164) as the sixth work and the *Bhavabhāvanā* and auto-commentary (dated saṃvat 1170) as the seventh and eighth works.

<sup>66</sup> *Bhavabhāvanā* p. 2 v.1b: *bhuvaṇam uvaesamālā bhūsai rayāṇāvali vva ekkā vi.*



*Upadeśapada*.<sup>67</sup> Haribhadra, author of the root verses of the *Upadeśapada*, gives a version of the story in question (vv. 697-728) which is not inordinately lengthy, and it seems very possible that HM is referring to Municandrasūri's commentarial expansion (pp. 325a-337b ) which is certainly longer than the UM auto-commentary narrative. Municandrasūri's commentary on the *Upadeśapada* was written in saṃvat 1174, that is 1117 /1118 CE, which would provide support for the *Bṛhaṭṭippānikā*'s dating of the UM auto-commentary.<sup>68</sup>

It is clear that there is not a precise chronological 'fit' between the sequence of writings given in HM's *praśasti* to the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣyavṛtti* and the data which can be gleaned elsewhere. However, since the evidence shows that all of the works in question were produced over a relatively short span of time, the most judicious assumption is that the *Upadeśamālā* and its auto-commentary were composed by HM in relatively close proximity sometime in the second decade of the twelfth century.

### 3. The Narratives in the *Upadeśamālāsvopajñavṛtti*

There are seventy-six main narratives occurring within the *Upadeśamālāsvopajñavṛtti* (henceforth SV).<sup>69</sup> These can be divided into two main categories: 'traditional' stories for which a pre-existing or near-contemporary version can be identified and stories which may be of HM's own devising. This latter category can be subdivided to include stories deploying a significant allegorical component which reflect HM's familiarity with the narrative techniques found in Siddharṣi's *Upamitibhava-prapañcakathā*.<sup>70</sup> It might seem to be possible to identify stories of HM's devising when they are introduced by the phrase “who was that x ?” (*ko 'yam.....*) after the main character has been specifically named. However, HM is not consistent in this, sometimes employing the phrase with reference to characters in narratives

---

<sup>67</sup> UM auto-commentary p. 194: *tad evaṃ saṅkṣepataḥ kathitam idaṃ, vistaratas tūpadeśapadebhyo 'vaseyam iti*. See section 3a no.5 below.

<sup>68</sup> For Municandrasūri's commentary on Haribhadra's *Upadeśapada*, see Balbir 1993: 119.

<sup>69</sup> I do not include stories whose protagonists HM refers to by name but does not actually recount. So SV p. 59 on UM v.19 refers to but does not recount the stories of the thief Rauhiṇeya (see Johnson 1924) and Indranāga (see Balbir 1993: 150) who gained deliverance through hearing one word preached by the Jina. Sādhusomagaṇin in summarising SV on UM v. 19 refers to the story of Cilātīputra (see Balbir 1993: 153) rather than that of Indranāga.

<sup>70</sup> See note 53. As noted on story 3a. no. 2, the SV's version of the story of Śāntinātha contains an allegorical component, but this is not central to the narrative's emplotment.

identifiable elsewhere and sometimes omitting it even when no analogue appears to be available.

Since a comprehensive inventory of versions of Jain narratives is an urgent scholarly desideratum, I have attempted to identify each story in SV (with the main protagonists given their Sanskrit names) by referencing parallel versions of the stories recounted by HM (providing brief plot summaries for those which I would judge to be less well known) or by citing relevant studies and translations. I also refer on several occasions to parallels (notably 5, 20, 24 and 53-56) occurring in Muncindrasūri's commentary on Haribhadra's *Upadeśapada*, since this is near contemporary with the SV. At the beginning of each identification I give the relevant UM verse and its context followed by the pagination of the narrative in the SV.

### 3a. Traditional Narratives

1. UM v. 3 (the difficulty of gaining rebirth); SV pp. 5-10: *Ten examples starting with 'Food' (collaga)*. See Balbir (1993: 147f.) for the occurrence of this cluster of narratives in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.<sup>71</sup>

2. UM v. 10 (providing safety); auto-commentary pp. 13-55: *Śāntinātha*. The extended versions of the life of the sixteenth *tīrthaṅkara* have been surveyed by Oberlies (2009) to whom SV was inaccessible.<sup>72</sup> The earliest example of the climax of the narrative (Ś. in his previous existence as Megharatha gives his own flesh to save a dove from a predatory hawk) occurs in Saṅghadāsa's *Vasudevahiṇḍi*.<sup>73</sup> Leaving aside the omission of some episodes found in other versions,<sup>74</sup> there are three noteworthy novelties in SV's recounting of the Śāntinātha story: (1) In the episode in which the ministers of king Śrīvijaya (the brother of Ś.'s previous

---

<sup>71</sup> At the conclusion of these short narratives HM quotes (SV p. 10) two Prakrit verses which he ascribes to the *bhāṣyakāra*, that is to say the anonymous author of the Āvaśyaka *mūlabhāṣya*: *dasahiṃ udāharanehiṃ dulaḥaṃ maṇuyattaṇaṃ jahā bhaṇiyaṃ / taha jāi kulāṇi vi dasadiṭṭhaṃtehiṃ dulaḥāiṃ // etthaṃ puvvaṃ puvvaṃ laddhuṃ pi tad uttaraṃ puṇo dulaḥaṃ / jaṃ māṇussaṇaṃ sudullaho teṇa jīṇadhammo*.

<sup>72</sup> Oberlies 2009: 310 n.37. Also inaccessible to Oberlies was the version of the story of Śāntinātha in Bhadrēśvara's *Kahāvalī*. See now pp. 71-76 of Kalyāṇakīrtivijaya's new edition. For the discussion between Śrīvijaya's ministers see pp.72-73 and for Vajrāyudha's protection of the dove see p.75.

<sup>73</sup> Mehta and Chandra 1972: 739f. collect the canonical and commentarial data relating to Śāntinātha which do not provide a narrative beyond the stereotyped events of his final existence as the Jina. At the beginning of his *Laghuvṛtti* on UM v.10 Sādhusomagaṇin reduces the lengthy SV version to 47 verses on the grounds that the story is sufficiently well known (*sugama*).

<sup>74</sup> For example, the so-called *Maṇḍalakalaśakathā* episode, for which see Oberlies 2009: 313.

existence Amitatejas) discuss how their master's imminent destruction can be averted, Vimalabuddhi gives an allegorical account of how the “internal” (*antaraṃga*) king Development of Karma (*Kammapariṇāma*) leads living beings to participate in the dramatic play of rebirth by making them assume various forms and states (SV pp. 21-22); (2) A scriptural quotation from *Bhagavatīsūtra* 3.2 (designated simply '*Prajñāptyām*') relating to the range of activity in various parts of the cosmos of princes of the demon (*asura*) class (SV pp. 39-40); (3) Vajrāyudha (in this version Ś.'s previous existence) experiences a nocturnal vision of *saṃsāra* as a terrifying funeral-ground (SV p. 48).

3. UM v. 13 (causing suffering to others eventually causes pain to oneself); SV pp. 56-61: *Mṛgāputra*. This story of a violent king who is reborn as an amorphous freak occurs in the canonical *Vipākasūtra*. See Mehta & Chandra (1972: 601).

4. UM v. 22 (on gaining knowledge); SV pp. 68-69: *Prince Abhaya and a vidyādhara*. A solution is provided to a difficulty with a flight-empowering spell which is deficient by one syllable. SV identifies this story, consisting of 8 verses, as occurring in the *Anuyogadvāracūrṇi*. However, the published version of this text does not in fact contain the story. Haribhadra in his commentary on *Anuyogadvārasūtra* sū. 13 (p. 40) gives a prose version in Prakrit, while in commenting on the same passage he provides another version in Sanskrit. For this story in the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* tradition, see Balbir (1993: 233-36).<sup>75</sup>

5. UM v. 64 (the nature of morality); SV pp. 187-94: *Ratisundarī and her three friends*. Four women maintain their chastity by demonstrating the disgusting nature of corporeality. SV states that this is an abbreviation of a more extended version found in the *Upadeśapada*. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 697-728 with Muncindrasūri's commentary (pp. 325a-337b).

6. UM v. 67 (the nature of morality); SV pp. 194-200: *Sītā* (to be taken in conjunction with the following story of Devasmitā). SV states that this story is well known both in Jainism and popularly and has accordingly been retold in abbreviated form simply to fill a narrative 'slot' in the SV (*sthānāśūnyārtham*).<sup>76</sup> For the Jain Sītā, see Kulkarni (1990).

7. UM v.67 (the nature of morality); SV. pp. 200-206:<sup>77</sup> *Devasmitā*.<sup>78</sup> Before leaving Tāmraliptī D.'s husband Jinasena vows to be faithful to his wife. The Jain goddess Senā gives

<sup>75</sup> For Digambara versions see Nagararajaiah 2008: 15 and 58.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. SV p. 435 on UM v. 258 for the story of Rāvaṇa being so famous that there is no need to retell it.

<sup>77</sup> There is a mispagination between pp. 204 and 208 in my copy of SV and vv. 74-110 of the narrative are missing. I have reconstructed their content on the basis of Sādhusomagaṇin's *Laghuvṛtti*. I have been unable to access another copy of the SV to establish whether this is a printing error reproduced elsewhere. See also note 85.

them each a lotus, telling them it will wither if the other is unfaithful.<sup>79</sup> J. then travels to Persia (*Pārasaula*)<sup>80</sup> where he conducts business while holding his lotus which remains unwithered. Four local merchants do not believe his account of D.'s chastity and they travel to Tāmraliptī where they pay a mendicant woman (*parivāyīā*)<sup>81</sup> to corrupt D. This woman, having ingratiated herself with D., gives meat mixed with astringent substances (*susamkayaṃ tikkhadavvehiṃ*) to the household dog which causes its eyes to ooze. She then feigns meditation and explains to D. that this bitch had been her sister in a previous life, a chaste and upright woman (*mahāsaī*) who did not yield to her many suitors, and now weeps from regret. D. is urged by her to fulfil her youth and meet four merchants who have come from Persia. However, D. and her servant trick the men, branding each one of them on the forehead with the mark of a dog's paw.<sup>82</sup> Without telling each other what has befallen them and hiding their forehead-brands they return to Persia after mutilating the mendicant woman. D. then becomes concerned that they will harm her husband and with the protection of the goddess Seṇā she travels to Persia where she turns the tables on the four merchants in the presence of the king by exposing them as servants who have fled Tāmraliptī after stealing money. She is reunited with her husband, going on to renounce and attain liberation. This narrative, whose Jain dimension is relatively insignificant (other than the intervention of the goddess and the conclusion), is a truncated version of a story found in Somadeva's (last third of the 11<sup>th</sup> century) *Kathāsaritsāgara* 2.5.54-193.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Buddhisaṅgaragaṇin, the editor of Sādhūsomagaṇin's *Laghuvṛtti*, gives the name of the protagonist of this story in the form 'Deva[sikā]senā (?)'. In the *Pāiasaddamaḥaṇṇavo* Sheth 1963: 480 gives *Puṣpamālā* v.67 as the only source for the Prakrit name Devasiyā, referring also to the Sanskrit equivalent Devasikā and the alternative name Devasenā.

<sup>79</sup> This goddess had been responsible for Jinasena's father Kamalākara gaining a son, as a result of which he converted to Jainism.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. SV p. 202 v. 136 for the designation *Pārasakula*. Sādhūsomagaṇin Sanskritises this as *Pārśvakūla*.

<sup>81</sup> The version of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* 2.5.88 describes the woman as a *pravrajikā*, making clear that she is a Buddhist (*sugatāyatanasthitā*). SV p. 201 v. 117 describes her simply as belonging to a *maṭha*. For observations on the nuances of meaning differentiating the terms *parivrājikā* and *pravrajikā*, see Jyväsjärvi 2007.

<sup>82</sup> The punishment prescribed for theft in the *Manusmṛti*; see Balbir et al. 1997: 1350 and Bollée 2006: 26f. The religion of the merchants is not specified, but if their origin in Persia implies that they are Muslims, then the references to the bitch and the dog's paw brand might be even more pointed in respect to a religious culture where dogs are regarded as particularly unclean. In the *Kathāsaritsāgara* version (see below), the merchants are linked with Kaṭāha, modern Kedāh in Malaysia (Tawney & Penzer 1968: 155). SV p. 202 v.30 describes Jinasena and his father travelling together to Kaḍāhadīva prior to the former's journey to Persia.

<sup>83</sup> I would thank Professor Willem B. Bollée for directing me towards this reference. See Balbir et al. 1997: 89-97 for a recent French version.

8. UM v. 68<sup>84</sup> (the objects of the senses lead to destruction); SV pp. 206-221:<sup>85</sup> *Mañiratha*. According to the *Abhidhānarājendra*, vol. 6 p. 94 s.v. Mañiraha, this story of a king who killed his brother to gain his wife and was reborn in hell occurs within the commentarial tradition of the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra*; see also Mehta & Chandra (1972: 544). The SV version contains a biography of King Nami (pp. 217-221) included as a secondary narrative (*prasaṅgataḥ*).<sup>86</sup>

9. UM v.78 (good looks as the result of asceticism); SV pp. 228-233: *Nandiṣeṇa*. SV states (p. 233 v.87) that this narrative of an earlier existence of Vasudeva who abandoned his wives in disgust is to be found in the *Harivaṃśa* section of the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*. See Saṅghadāsa, *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, pp. 114-18.

10. UM v.82 (even the evil can attain liberation through austerity); SV pp. 234-36: *Dṛḍhaprahārin*. This story of the thief who became a monk occurs in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition. See Mehta & Candra (1970: 355).

11. UM v.83 (the power of austerity); SV pp. 237-41: *Viṣṇukumāra*. See Jain 1980 for this Jain version of the story of Viṣṇu and Namuci occurring in a range of sources, the earliest of which seems to be the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*.

12. UM v.84 (the power of austerity); SV pp. 242-47: *Skandaka*. This canonical narrative of a brahman convert and subsequent illustrious Jain renunciant occurs at *Bhagavatīsūtra* 2.1. See Deleu (1970: 89f.).

13. UM v.145 (compassion for living creatures); auto-commentary pp. 319-22: *Dharmaruci*. The SV version emphasises that Nāgaśrī, who gave tainted alms to Dharmaruci which he then ate to avoid killing life-forms, was later reborn as Draupadī. Cf. Balbir (1993: 187) for the occurrence of this story in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition and cf. Mette (2010: 176f. and 373-75).

14. UM v.149 (speaking truth about religious matters); SV pp. 323-25: *Kālakasūri*. This narrative, whose theme is the evil of animal sacrifice, is thematically linked with 3a 15. SV p. 324 quotes five Sanskrit verses ascribed to Vyāsa in which the components of the Vedic sacrifice are reinterpreted within a purely moral framework. See Balbir (1993: 153) for the

---

<sup>84</sup> Correct v.58 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

<sup>85</sup> There is a lacuna in my copy of Ānandasāgara's 1936 edition: vv. 74-109 of SV are missing while In my copy of SV pp. 209-12 are mispaginated.

<sup>86</sup> At SV p. 219 ll. 12 and 14 there are brief Sanskrit insertions to signal the exchange between Indra and Nami which introduces the famous statement *Mihilāe ḍajjhamāṇē na me ḍajjhai* [correct SV reading *ujjhai*] *kiṃcāṇa*.

occurrence of this story in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition and cf. Brown (1933: 105) and 107.

15. UM v.150 (speaking truth about religious matters); SV pp. 325-30: *Nārada and Vasu*. The narrative prototype for this story occurs in the *Mahābhārata* 12.323, for which see Kulkarni (2001: 152-55) and Smith (2009: 661), while the earliest of several Jain versions is found in Saṅghadāsa's *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, pp. 189-91. The SV version switches (p. 327 l.12) from Prakrit to Sanskrit (including quotations from *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* 5.1.3 and five verses from Vyāsa)<sup>87</sup> with the exception of three Prakrit verses concerning the power of truth (p. 329).

16. UM v. 152 (avoidance of taking what has not been given); SV pp. 330-37: *Nāgadatta*. Nāgadatta is a pious merchant's son loved by Nāgavasū. He ignores the king's lost earring when he sees it in the dust. His rival Vasudatta puts the earring on Nāgadatta while he is meditating and then informs the king in the hope that he can thus win Nāgavasū. Nāgadatta refuses to tell the king what happened because he does not want Vasudatta to be harmed. He is sentenced to death but because of the intervention of a goddess the stake on which he is to be impaled turns into a throne. This would appear to be a reasonably close variant of a Nāgadatta story found in the Digambara Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathākoṣa*, for which see Williams 1959: 34.

17. UM v.157<sup>88</sup> (sexual restraint); SV pp. 338-344: *Sudarśana*. In an earlier birth as a cowherd the hero shows devotion to a monk absorbed in the disciplinary activity of *kāyotsarga*, while in his birth as Sudarśana he keeps quiet about Queen Abhayā's infidelity at the cost of being sentenced to death. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 526-28 with Municandrasūri's commentary (pp. 258a-64a); for earlier versions in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition, see Mehta & Chandra (1972: 816) s.v. 9. Sudamaṣaṇa.

18. UM v. 158<sup>89</sup> (sexual restraint); SV pp. 345-51: *Sthūlabhadra*. This narrative of the monk who maintained celibacy even when lodging near his former lover occurs in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition. See Dundas (2008: 182-84) and Leumann (1934/2010: 74).

19. UM v. 162 (possessions as the root of quarrelling); SV pp. 352-59: *the king of Campā*. The protagonist is identified at p. 352 v. 2 as Kīrticandra. A story of two brothers who pursue each other violently and are reborn in the various hells. The *Abhidhānarājendra*, vol. 3 p. 530 s.v. Kitticaṇḍa, identifies the story of Kīrticandra as occurring in Śāntisūri's

---

<sup>87</sup> Unusually Sādhusomagaṇin in his *Laghuvṛtti* reproduces one of these verses in Prakrit form.

<sup>88</sup> Correct v. 152 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

<sup>89</sup> Correct v. 118 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

*Dharmaratnaprakaraṇa*, adding that in another source he is known as Akrūra.<sup>90</sup> The SV version switches from Prakrit to Sanskrit (pp. 355-58) when a *kevalin* tells one of the protagonists about his past existence.

20. UM v. 175 (maintaining care about movement); SV pp. 372-74: *Varadattamuni*. A malevolent god conjures up frogs on V.'s path to test him, but he does not step on them even when attacked by a marauding elephant. Cf. Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 608-12 with Municandrasūri's commentary (p. 288).

21. UM v. 178 (maintaining care about speech); SV pp. 375-77: *the monk Saṃgata*. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 613-17 with Municandrasūri's commentary (pp. 288b-289a) and for other versions in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition, see Balbir (1993: 177) (unnamed protagonist). The SV follows the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* version in quoting *Daśavaikālikasūtra* 8.20 to confirm the validity of S.'s renunciant integrity in refusing to disclose information to a general despite seeing and hearing about the situation in a besieged city.

22. UM v. 185 (maintaining care about alms-seeking); SV pp. 379-81: *Dhanaśarman*. See Mehta and Chandra (1972: 395) for this story of a monk who refused to break his fast by taking water occurring within the commentarial tradition of the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra* and cf. Kulkarni (1994: 253f.), who provides a version based on this.

23. UM v.185 (avoidance of inappropriate alms); SV pp. 381f.: *Dharmaruci*. The story of Dh. who did not break his fast when near death as he was travelling through a forest occurs in the *Oghaniryukti* and its commentaries. See Bollée (1994: 250) s.v. Dhamma-rui and Mehta and Chandra (1970: 402) s.v. 7. Dhammarui.

24. UM v.188 (care about picking up and depositing objects); SV pp. 382-4: *the monk Somilārya*. Somilārya is unwilling to clean his fellow monks' alms bowls diligently, whereupon a god inserts a snake within them in order to instruct him. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 640-44 with Municandrasūri's commentary (pp. 296b-297b).

25. UM v.190 (care about voiding bowels); SV pp. 384f.: *Dharmaruci*. Even at the conclusion of his life Dh. did not dispose of his bodily wastes inappropriately. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 648-49 with Municandrasūri's commentary (p. 297).

26. UM v.194 (maintaining control of the mind); SV pp. 386-88: *a layman engaged in disciplinary activity (paḍimā)*. The protagonist is identified at v.1 as Jinadāsa. See Balbir 1993: 176 for this story occurring in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.

---

<sup>90</sup> The other source is identified simply as 'Pra.Bhā' which does not occur in the list of abbreviations in volume one of the *Abhidhānarājendra*. In the edition of Śāntisūri's *Dharmaratnaprakaraṇa* available to me the term 'akrūra' ("benign") occurs (p.9b) with reference to the fifth *guṇasthāna*, but there is no accompanying narrative of an eponymous hero.

27. UM v.197 (maintaining control of speech); SV pp. 389f.: *the monk Guṇadatta whose relatives were seized by brigands*. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 654-59 with Muncindrasūri's commentary (pp. 308b-309b) and also Balbir (1993: 176) for the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.<sup>91</sup>

28. UM v. 199 (maintaining control of the body); SV p. 39: *a monk*. The anonymous protagonist passes the night standing on one foot to avoid injury to life forms. This is a variant of an Āvaśyaka story described by Balbir (1993: 176).

29. UM v. 219 (correct mental culture); SV pp. 401-405: *Prasannacandra*. This is an emboxed narrative in which Mahāvīra describes to King Śreṇika the career of Prasannacandra, a monk who found it difficult to break from his life as king. SV states at the beginning of the narrative that the story of Prasannacandra is well-known (*atipratīta*) in sources such as the Āvaśyaka literature and has been included in part simply to fill a narrative slot (*sthānāsūnyārtham*). See Balbir (1993: 149) and Kulkarni (1994: 105-10).

30. UM v. 234<sup>92</sup> (exception to a general rule); SV pp. 412-17: *Kālakasūri*. K. remained of pure disposition despite doing something ostensibly forbidden, namely altering the date of Paryuṣaṇ. According to SV p. 417 the full details of this story are to be obtained from the *Niśīthacūrṇi*. See Dundas (2007).

---

<sup>91</sup> In justifying his maintenance of a vow of silence even at the cost of endangering his captured relatives G. argues thus (SV p. 390 vv. 18-20): “If this woman is my mother, that is irrelevant. For those who treat enemies and friends as the same, who can be regarded as a foe and who as a family member? Furthermore, all these souls have been born in the state of the mother, son, father and so on of souls wandering in the beginningless ocean of existence. Which person has not been born endlessly as the mother or antagonist of everybody among souls which wander together on the endless wheel of existence?” ( *jaṃ pi hu eṣā jaṇaṇī majjha imam pi hu akāraṇaṃ ettha / samasattumittacittāṇaṃ ko paro ko vajaṃ sayāṇo // annaṃ ca ime jīvā aṇāibhavasāgare bhamamītaṇaṃ / jāyā savve 'pi hu māiputtapiipamuhabhāvehiṃ // to kassa ko na māyā na veriṇī vā aṇamāso jāyā / avaropparaṃ jiyāṇaṃ aṇamābhavacakkabhamirāṇaṃ //*  ) This is very similar in tone to Mahāyāna Buddhist ethics as propounded by teachers like Aśiśa and Kamalaśīla who enjoin the saintlike bodhisattva to treat his enemies as if they were friends and view every being as having been at some point in time his mother. See Lopez 1990: 189-91. However, whereas in Buddhism the aim of this intra-personal realignment is to enable the bodhisattva to engender compassion, in SV's rather stark narrative G. concludes that the honour given to a mother is inappropriate if not directed towards the omniscient Jina (*na ya mottuṃ savvaṇṇuṃ jutto jaṇaṇīe hoi bahumāṇo*). Although SV rarely refers to Jainism's ancient bugbear, the Buddhists, it may be mentioned that the work commences (pp. 2f. on UM v.1) with a pointed comparison between the Jina, whose liberation from rebirth is final and unambiguous, and the Buddha (*śāstṛ*) who, it is suggested, has attained deliverance yet still returns to *saṃsāra* when there is some serious threat to his community (*tīrthaparābhāvādikāraṇāt*). To support this distinction HM quotes a verse which elsewhere (Dundas 2003: 161 n. 1) I have attributed to Malliṣeṇasūri's *Syādvādamāñjarī* but in fact occurs much earlier in Haribhadra's commentary on *Āvaśyakaniryukti* v. 1079.

<sup>92</sup> Correct v. 224 of Ānandasāgara's edition.



31. UM v.254<sup>93</sup> (the performance of an incomplete form of the *sāmāyika* observance); SV pp. 426-30: *King Samprati*. In a previous existence as a starving beggar S. had been initiated by Āryasuhaṣṭin and then after living as a monk for one day died of a surfeit of food. See Mehta and Chandra (1972: 741) for the occurrence of this story in the *Chedasūtra* commentaries.

32. UM v. 271<sup>94</sup> (influence of senses: hearing); SV pp. 436-38: *Subhadrā*. S. died as a result of her infatuation with music. See Mehta and Candra (1972: 517): s.v. 4. Bhaddā for the occurrence of this story in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.<sup>95</sup>

33. UM v. 271<sup>96</sup> (influence of senses: smell); SV pp. 450-52: *a prince*. At p. 451 v. 13 the protagonist is identified as Gandhapriya. G., addicted to scents, is poisoned by one of his father's wives who desires the kingdom for her son. See Mehta and Chandra (1972: 221) s.v. Gaṇḍhappiya for the occurrence of this story in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.

34. UM v. 272<sup>97</sup> (influence of senses: touch); auto-commentary pp. 457-59: *Sukumārikā*. A king loses his kingdom and feeds his wife, the hyperrefined S., with his own flesh. See Mehta and Chandra (1972: 807) for the occurrence of this story in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition and cf. Williams (1959: 30-33) for a further range of parallels.

35. UM v. 295 (forbearance in the face of ill-treatment); SV pp. 466-70: *Acaṃkāriya*. The girl who was excessively proud of her beauty. See Mehta and Candra (1970: 22) s.v. Accaṃkāriya-Bhaṭṭā for the occurrence of this story in the *Niśīthacūrṇi* and *Niśīthabhāṣya* and cf. Williams (1959: 19f.) who refers to a parallel narrative (Acaṃkāritābhaṭṭikā) in the Digambara Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathākoṣa*.

36. UM v. 295 (forbearance in the face of ill-treatment); SV pp. 471-74: *a junior monk (kṣullaka)*. This monk's previous existence as a snake led to him craving for food when a monk; he did not become angry when another monk spat in his alms bowl. The SV version concludes with *iti Nāgadattamunikathānakaṃ samāptam*, while the margin of Ānandasāgara's edition has *Kūragaḍḍukodāharaṇam*. In his *Laghuvṛtti* Sādhūsomagaṇin gives the protagonist's name as Kūragaḍḍuyaga. See Kulkarni (1994: 321-23) and Leumann (1998:

---

<sup>93</sup> Correct v. 244 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

<sup>94</sup> Correct v. 261 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

<sup>95</sup> This Subhadrā is to be distinguished from the better known homonymous laywoman who was a paragon of virtue, for whom see Kelting 2009: 59f.

<sup>96</sup> Correct v. 261 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

<sup>97</sup> Correct v. 262 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

230f.) for the occurrence of this story in the *Daśavaikālikasūtra* commentarial tradition where the protagonist is called Nāgadatta.

37. UM v.312 (greed increases as wealth increases); SV pp. 489-93: *Kapila*. This story of a brahman who became a monk after reflecting on his obsessive desire to gain money from a king occurs in the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* commentarial tradition. See Mehta and Chandra (1970: 165) s.v. 4. Kavila

38. UM v. 312 (greed increases as wealth increases); SV pp. 493-98: *a junior monk (kṣullaka)*. The protagonist is named at p. 493 l.14 as Āṣāḍhabhūti. This story of the monk whose greed for sweets led him to abandon the life of a monk and become an actor occurs at *Piṇḍaniryukti* vv. 474-80. See Bollée (1994: 133) s.v. Asāḍa-bhūi and Mehta and Chandra (1970: 95) (correcting reference to the source).

39. UM v. 351<sup>98</sup> (duties incumbent in living among a teacher's pupils); SV pp. 526-31: *Panthaka*. A canonical story from the *Jñāṭṛdharmaśāstra*. King Selaka renounces but still behaves like a ruler; Panthaka brings him back to his senses. See Schubring (1978: 20-22).

40. UM v.353 (abandoning one's teacher and fellow pupils leads to breaking all the ascetic vows); SV pp. 532-35: *Kūlavālaka*. At the beginning of this story SV describes how a pupil was inimical (*paḍikūla*) to his teacher “like a poisoned thorn” (*visakaṃṭha*) and dropped a rock (*silā*) upon him. The latter portion of the story deals with “the Battle of the Rocks and the Thorns” (*mahāsilākaṃṭhayaṃ*) between Kūṇika and Ceṭaka which took place before the city of Vaiśālī. See Balbir (1993: 169) and Koch (1990: 332-35, 2009: 286) for this narrative occurring in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Correct v. 330 of Ānandasāgara's edition.

<sup>99</sup> Many versions of this story occur in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, sometimes evincing a strong degree of intertextuality (e.g. Mūnicandrasūri, commentary on Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* v. 149 pp. 132-35, reproduces with minor variants the version of Jinacandrasūri, *Samvegaramgaśālā*, pp. 98-105, written in 1069), which point the moral as being either the danger of sexual incontinence ( cf. Āmradeva's commentary on Nemicaṇḍra's *Ākhyānakamaṇikoṣa* pp. 272-74, where the story of K. is combined with that of Arahannaka; see section 3a no. 52) or, as in the SV, of disrespecting and then abandoning one's teacher. The SV version is more successful than most in linking the admonitory theme with the political narrative. The story turns around a punningly self-referential verse employing -l- for -r- characteristic of the Māgadhī (*Māgahiya*) dialect and composed in *gaṇa* (*vaitālīya*) metre. Cf. Mette 1983: 43. The SV version reads: *samaṇe jai Kūlavālae Māgahiyaṃ gaṇiyaṃ gamissaī / lāyā ya Asogaṇḍae vesāliṃ naḡarīm laissaī* (“If the ascetic Kūlavālaka will make love with the prostitute Māgadhikā / compose a little Māgadhī verse (?), then King Aśokacandra [i.e. Kūṇika] will capture the city of Vaiśālī”). This verse can be included within the genre of what Alsdorf 1998 in an examination of phonetically similar poetry in the *Maṇipaticarita* characterised as 'Volksdichtung' (see also Wright 1999 529-34), although the general context might better be taken as the learned playfulness redolent of courtly culture. The Māgadhī diction of the verse may extend to Kūlavālaka's own name, namely < *kūla-pāraka*, “ending a fast on the bank of a river”, although it is explained otherwise in the story.

41. UM v.372 (evil comes about when even a small fault is unconfessed); SV pp. 542-51: *the son of a king*. The protagonist is identified at p. 543 v. 19 as Prince Ādraka. In a previous existence as a monk Ā. had not confessed his continuing passion for his wife. For this story occurring in the *Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra* commentarial tradition, see Bollée (2004: 50 and 53f.).

42. UM v.372 (evil comes about when even a small fault is unconfessed); SV pp. 552-56: *the son of a merchant*. The protagonist is identified at p. 552 v. 11as Ilāputra, a former acrobat who as a monk repents of his former desire for women. See Balbir (1990: 32f.) for this narrative's occurrence in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.

43. UM v. 390 (the insubstantial nature of a mother's love); SV pp. 562-64: *Culanī*. The SV version is in Sanskrit. This narrative of two untouchable brothers, one of whom is reborn as a *cakravartin* and the other of whom tries to restrain him, is also known as the story of Citra and Saṃbhūta and belongs to the cycle of narratives relating to King Brahmadaṭṭa. See Leumann (1998: 125-206) and Oberlies (1997).

44. UM v. 390 (the insubstantial nature of a father's love); SV pp. 564-68: *Kanakaratha*. This story of the king who mutilated his sons in fear that they would depose him occurs in the canonical *Jñātrdharmakathāsūtra*. See Schubring (1978: 45) and cf. Tawney (1975: 184-91).

45. UM v. 391 (the insubstantial nature of a relative's love); SV pp. 568-72: *the cakravartin Bharata*. The story of Bh.'s conflict with his half-brother Bāhubali. See Balbir (1993: 132f.) for the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition and Dundas (1991: 180) for the occurrence of this story in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*.

46. UM v.391 (the insubstantial nature of a wife's love for a husband); SV pp. 572-78: *the wife of a king*. The protagonist is identified at p. 572 v. 4 as King Pradeśin's wife Sūryakāntā. See Bollée (2002: 167-74) for the canonical version in the *Rājaprasānīyasūtra*. SV pp. 573 l. 9-575 gives a Sanskrit prose account of the monk Keśin's conversion of Pradeśin to Jainism.

47. UM v. 391 (the insubstantial nature of a son's love for a father); SV pp. 578-84: *Aśokacandra*. The protagonist is also known as Kūṇika. See Balbir (1993: 182) for the occurrence in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition of this story of the king who imprisoned his father.

48. UM v. 393 (the insubstantial nature of sense objects); SV pp. 584-90: *two brothers*. The protagonists are identified at p. 585 vv. 2-3 as Jinapālita and Jinarakṣita, the sons of Mākandī. This story of Jinarakṣita who gave way to temptation and was destroyed by a malevolent deity and his brother who remained disciplined occurs in the canonical *Jñātrdharmakathāsūtra*. See Kulkarni (1994: 295-302) and Schubring (1978: 35-37).

49. UM v. 422 (monks should care for each other); SV pp. 610-18: *the prince who was the son of king Dhanada*. The protagonist is identified at p. 611 v. 4 as Bhuvanatilaka. Bhuvanatilaka becomes ill as a result of having attempted to poison monks in a previous existence. SV pp. 611 v.8-614 v.8 switches to Sanskrit for a lengthy description of a riddling contest held in Dhanada's court. The *Abhidhānarājendra*, vol. 5 pp. 1592-94 s.v. Bhuvanatilaya, gives a version of this story in 57 Prakrit verses, ascribing it to the *Dharmaratnaprakaraṇa*.

50. UM v. 425 (renunciants should not concern themselves with laypeople); SV pp. 619-24: *Subhadrā*. A nun who continued to love children. See Wiles (2000: 237-67) for the canonical version of this story in the *Nirayāvalikāśrutaskandha*.<sup>100</sup>

51. UM v. 438 (the benefits of the *namaskāra mantra*); SV pp. 628-36: *Tridaṇḍin, Śrīmatī, Mātuliṅga, Caṇḍapiṅgala and Huṇḍika*. See Balbir (1993: 169f.) for this cluster of narratives occurring in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition.

52. UM v. 479 (the evils of continuing contact with women); SV. p. 637-40: *a monk who remained near his home because of attachment to a woman*. The protagonist is identified at p. 637 v. 2 as Arahannaka. See Balbir (1993: 155) for this story occurring in the Āvaśyaka commentarial tradition and cf. Kulkarni (1994: 255f.).

53. UM v. 453 (faults such as embezzling money belonging to a temple); SV pp. 642-45: *Samkāśa*. The layman Samkāśa assumed control over the property of his temple and because he was upright and prosperous his fellow laymen did not concern themselves. Once he put some temple money into his wallet with his other money, thinking that he would replace it, but he forgot. Matters accelerated and as his affairs got worse the temple money was eaten up; he resolved to pay it back but never did. Becoming psychologically disturbed, Samkāśa died unconfessed and unrepentant and experienced terrible rebirths. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 403-412 with Municandrasūri's commentary (p. 228b).

54. UM v. 464 (no discussion of another's faults without hatred); SV pp. 658-59: *an ascetic*. The committed ascetic Agnisimha develops hatred towards the lax ascetic Aruṇa who does not engage in proper practice. Aruṇa, however, praises Agnisimha's qualities and rebukes himself for falling from the proper path. As a result, Agnisimha increases his future existences whereas Aruṇa restricts those he will undergo. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 486-88 with Municandrasūri's commentary (pp. 248b-249a).

55. UM v. 464 (no discussion of another's faults without hatred); SV pp. 659-60: *Queen Kuntalā*. Kuntalā develops such hatred towards her fellow queens who spend their wealth on getting temples built that she becomes ill and dies. She is reborn as a bitch who stations

---

<sup>100</sup> See note 95.

herself at the door of her own temple. The women of the harem compassionately throw scraps to the bitch and through listening to them she remembers her previous birth and fasts to death, ultimately being reborn among the *vaimānika* gods. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* v. 485 with Municandrasūri's commentary (p. 250) and Jineśvarasūri, *Kathākoṣaparakaraṇa* pp. 129-30.

56. UM v. 464 (no discussion of another's faults without hatred); SV pp. 660f.: *a teacher (sūri)*. A learned but lax teacher develops hatred of a talented and popular pupil. Reborn as snake, he continually attacks his pupil who has become the *ācārya*. See Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* vv. 489-91 with Municandrasūri's commentary (p. 249).

57. UM v. 468 (steadfastness in religion); SV pp. 662-64: *a pair of parrots*. Two parrots worship the Jina with flowers in a forest temple. The male is reborn as a prince, while the female is reborn as his wife. After a series of positive rebirths together as gods and *vidyādharas*, which the Jina explains as the result of their pious worship, the two take ascetic renunciation from him and gain liberation. See Jineśvarasūri, *Kathākoṣaparakaraṇa* pp. 2-11 and Tawney (1975: 42-53) for the theme of parrots gaining liberation through worshipping the Jina.

58. UM v. 478 (steadfastness in religion); SVpp. 668-78: *Dhanamitra*. Dh. is a merchant whose every enterprise has led to failure. After hunting for treasure and finding only coal, he is eventually robbed and reduced to destitution. The monk Guṇasāgara reveals to Dh. that in his previous birth he had been hostile to worship of the Jinās and could not endure the success which others gained through this practice. As a result he has been reborn as a poor man, albeit in a good family. Now firm in his commitment to Jainism, Dh. gathers forest flowers to worship the Jina and his fortunes revive. Subsequently he obtains money from a man who is abandoning gold under the delusion that it is coal and devotes it to Jainism, eventually renouncing and gaining liberation. The *Abhidhānarājendra*, vol. 4 pp. 2655-56 s.v. Dhaṇamitta, gives a Prakrit version of this story in 180 verses attributing it to the *Dharmaratnaparakaraṇa*.

Of the above narratives seven (nos. 3, 12, 39, 44, 46, 48 and 50) can be identified as 'canonical': that is, they occur in the *aṅga* and *upāṅga* texts of the Śvetāmbara *āgama*. The majority (1, 4, 8, 10, 13-14, 16, 18, 20-23, 26-238, 40-43, 45, 47 and 51-52) seem to have been in circulation from around the middle of the first millennium CE within the commentarial tradition, particularly on the *Āvaśyakasūtra*. The story of Śāntinātha (no. 2) seems to belong to an almost independent narrative cluster, while another (no.2) is unique in having a likely extra-Jain provenance.

### 3b. Narratives with Non-Identifiable Parallels

The following stories are provisionally unidentified; that is to say, no precise parallels are available to me at present, although several of the stories contain themes and motifs which can be found elsewhere. Most notably, nos. 4, 5 and 7 reproduce standard Jain arguments against brahman claims to social and ritual superiority.

1. UM v. 38 (knowledge providing help in difficulties); SV pp. 143-64: *Sāgaracandra*. S. buys a verse for 500 dīnāras which enables him to defeat a *vidyādhara* prince.<sup>101</sup> Later through the teaching of the *kevalin* Bhuvanacandra he is made aware of his previous existences and the reasons for the continual violence he has experienced at the hands of a demon. He reflects that knowledge of a single verse has been able to sustain him through various vicissitudes and gain him several marriages. After renunciation he goes on to master the Pūrva texts.

2. UM v. 52 (giving to appropriate recipients); SVpp. 169-78: *the two brothers who were sons of king Śūrasena*.<sup>102</sup> The two protagonists were originally a cowherd and a labourer. Impressed by the prosperity of their employer, a merchant, they emulated him in pious generosity to the extent that they were reborn as princely brothers, Amarasena and Varasena. Eventually they are compelled to flee their father Śūrasena's kingdom because of the machinations of one of his wives, subsequently experiencing a variety of adventures involving spells (one of the brothers is magically transformed into an ass and then gets the better of a cheating procuress by turning her into that same beast).<sup>103</sup> They gain memory of their previous existences by seeing two Jain monks which eventually leads to liberation.

3. UM v. 59 (not giving to appropriate recipients); SV pp. 181-85: *a merchant of Mathurā*. The protagonist is identified in v. 2 as Dhanasāra. Dh. loses his riches as a result of his aversion to liberality in a previous existence. After the bulk of his wealth is consumed by theft and fire, he sets out to sea from Tāmraliptī with the residue but loses it in a shipwreck and is cast ashore to lament his fate. However, he encounters a *kevalin* who informs him that in a previous existence he had laid false witness against his brother whose wealth had increased through his piety and liberality. He is reborn as a demon while his brother is reborn

---

<sup>101</sup> For this motif see Oberlies 2009: 314 and Tawney 1895: 28.

<sup>102</sup> The *AmarasenaVajrasenakathānaka* of the 16th cen Matinandanagaṇin may be a version of this narrative. See Caudharī 1973: 322.

<sup>103</sup> A possible comparison with a similar scenario in Apuleius's *Metamorphoses* hardly needs to be noted.

as a god. This god is then as reborn as the *kevalin* who informs his former brother, now reborn as Dh., of his past. Dh. consequently attains correct religious disposition (*samyaktva*), vowing to dedicate three quarters of his future wealth to Jainism, and eventually manages to return to Tāmraliptī. One night, while performing lay austerity (*pratimā*) in an empty house, Dh. is attacked by a *vyantara* deity but remains undisturbed.<sup>104</sup> In the morning the deity offers him a boon which he refuses to accept. The deity, impressed, tells him to go to Mathurā where he will become a master of vast wealth. As a result of his liberality, Dh. gains deliverance. SV ends the story with the following comment which may refer to HM's own authorship: “The story relates to the main theme (*prakṛtopayogi*) as far as the description of Dhanasāra becoming grief-stricken on the shore of the ocean, while the remainder of the narrative is secondary (*prasaṅgataḥ*).”

4. UM v. 103 (firmness in correct disposition); SV 255-67: *Amaradatta's wife*. While on a trading expedition to Suvarṇapura A., a non-Jain merchant of Dvārakā, falls in love with a Jain girl Vimalayaśā who asserts that she will only marry a man who defeats her in debate. A. cannot best her since she deploys the truths of Jainism.<sup>105</sup> After pretending to become a Jain layman in order to win her,<sup>106</sup> he then sincerely converts. A.'s parents plot against V. so that their son might doubt her chastity. She attempts to prevent calumny of the Jain religion by drowning herself, but she is rescued by goddesses who convey her home on a golden throne. After renouncing, she is told by a *kevalin* that all this has happened because in her previous birth she had ascribed a fault to a co-wife.

5. UM v. 165 (cessation from eating at night); SV pp. 361-66: *Ravigupta*. R., a brahman addicted to food of every kind and the performance of sacrifices, mocks Jain laymen for not eating at night. He himself dies as a result of this habit and is reborn as a brahman called Vāmadeva who persists in deriding Jains because of their dietary discipline. He is poisoned through accidentally eating a snake and is cured only with difficulty. A *kevalin* tells him about his previous existence and confirms that renunciation as a Jain monk is the only way to escape the results of his evil actions.<sup>107</sup> The story then switches (p. 363 l. 6) from Prakrit to

---

<sup>104</sup> This narrative theme is as old as the canonical *Upāsakadaśāḥ*.

<sup>105</sup> SV p. 259 vv. 66-73 are Sanskrit verses calling into question brahmanical notions of purity.

<sup>106</sup> For this narrative motif, see Dundas 2002: 242.

<sup>107</sup> Sādhūsomagaṇin's Sanskrit epitomising version ends at this point.

Sanskrit to encompass a debate in which Vāmadeva convinces his brahman father of the weakness of the traditional sources for the status and purity of brahmans.<sup>108</sup>

6. UM v.166 (the great vows must be strenuously maintained); SV pp. 366-68: *the poor man who safeguarded the vows as if they were jewels*. A poor man from Kauśāmbī who has heard the preceptor of a school (*viġjāmaṭha*) defining the nature of poverty asks for the means of gaining money. On being told that these are a field of sugar cane, the ocean, growing crops or the goodwill of a king, he proceeds to serve the preceptor as if he were the ocean and as a result the god of the sea in pleasure gives him five valuable jewels. He employs various stratagems to protect the jewels from thieves and by staying close to the highway manages to convey them safely to his home city. In the same way monks should take the great vows from their teacher, who is like the ocean, keep to the path of knowledge out of range of the thief-like passions and so reach the city of liberation.

7. UM v.303 (pride in birth); SV pp. 476-80: *the brahman who became an untouchable through his pride*.<sup>109</sup> The brahman Brahmadeva is so arrogantly convinced of the superiority of the class to which he belongs that the king removes him from his hereditary position as *purohita*. Now impoverished, he resolves to go to a place where there are no impure people but ends up in an untouchable (*ḍomba*) village. Stabbed to death for cursing a *ḍomba* who has touched him, Brahmadeva is reborn as his son, a one-eyed lame hunchback who terrifies even his father. After a succession of low and painful existences, he is reborn as Madana, the handsome, strong and talented son of a courtesan, but he is still mocked for his poverty. On being told of his previous births by a *kevalin*, he asks him to bestow ascetic initiation. The *kevalin* considers that while the Jinas have forbidden this for people of low birth,<sup>110</sup> M. will nonetheless become a suitable adherent of Jainism. He eventually attains liberation after rebirth in the Māhendra heaven.

8. UM v. 305 (pride in birth); SV pp. 480-87: *the merchant's daughter who experiences suffering through her deception*. Vasumatī is the daughter of Sudhanu, a merchant of Śrāvastī, and his wife Abhayaśrī.<sup>111</sup> She is befriended by Bahulī, “Rumour”,<sup>112</sup> who is allegorically

---

<sup>108</sup> Vāmadeva quotes verses ascribed to Manu (only 10.92 is identifiable in Olivelle's edition), a paraphrase of *R̥gVeda* 10.90 (the *Puruṣasūkta*) and a series of verses in which Viṣṇu addresses Yudhiṣṭhira in order to point to the nonsensical nature of brahman claims to high status.

<sup>109</sup> SV sets the story in Jayapura, Sādhūsomagaṇin in Gajapura.

<sup>110</sup> *dikkhā jñehiṃ samae paḍisiddhā hñajāipamuhāṇaṃ*.

<sup>111</sup> The text of SV is a little unclear. According to Sādhūsomagaṇin's epitomising version, Sudhanu had two wives named Amṛtaśrī and Kamalaśrī.

<sup>112</sup> Or possibly 'Falsehood'.



described as the daughter of Passion-Lion (*rāgakesarin*) and the grand-daughter of King Delusion (*moha*) who wanders unchecked to conquer the world. After the death of her mother S. marries Kamalā. V. contrives to get S. to reject K. by accusing her of uncleanness and then after seeing her weeping for a period of twelve hours dissembles again to persuade her father to take her back. V. dies after engaging in austerity and is reborn as a courtesan among the *vyantara* deities. Eventually she is reborn as a merchant's daughter Kamalinī and is betrothed to Vasudatta. He is jestingly informed by his friends about her hideous ill-looks and so he refuses to look at her face, blindfolding himself at the marriage and then going on to spurn her for twelve years. The two are eventually brought together and Kamalinī is told by a monk that her treatment of Kamalā is responsible for Vasudatta's treatment of her.

9. UM vv. 338-39 (necessity of guidance); SV p. 522: *exemplifying how both a teacher and a pupil can be brought down by the latter's faults*. A boy regularly steals sesamum and gives it to his mother who does not rebuke him. The young thief is arrested and taken to the execution ground. He calls for his mother who is brought by the guards, whereupon she cuts off her breasts.

10. UM v. 345 (a teacher is asked by a king about the direction to which the Ganges flows; one must behave in every respect as his pupil did); SV p. 525. The protagonists are unnamed. The story is given in Sanskrit. A king and a Jain teacher debate to see whether princes or monks are the more disciplined. As a test a prince is dispatched to see in which direction the Ganges flows. The prince goes only half way because he knows for sure that the Ganges flows to the east and then returns. A monk is then dispatched by the teacher. He first considers that the teacher must know that Ganges flows east, so there has to be a reason for his mission. He goes to the Ganges and having considered it from various angles (*svataḥ parataḥ viśeṣataś ca*) returns to the teacher to confirm that the Ganges flows in an easterly direction and that his revered master knows the truth. The respective behaviour of the prince and the monk is revealed to the king by spies and he accepts that monks are more disciplined than princes. All pupils must behave with discipline when addressed by their teacher.

11. UM v. 417 (the results of discipline in this world and the next); SV pp. 598-607: *Siṃharatha*. The disobedient prince S. is expelled by his father. At Hāstinapura he sees two horses, one being treated with every sort of care and the other being beaten. He is told that the first horse is disciplined and since it moves in accord with the intention of his master it is honoured, while the second horse is undisciplined and so is beaten. In the light of this the prince disciplines himself and subsequently inherits the kingdom from his father. Eventually he and his father both renounce, winning the kingdom of austerity and so liberation. Thus S. gained two kingdoms through following discipline.

12. UM v. 468 (the results of *pūjā* with various substances); SV pp. 664f.: *Vimala and seven others*. A king sees eight gods worshipping the Jina with substances like perfume and asks how they have attained their exalted state. They reply that in their previous birth they had been eight sons of a merchant of whom the first was V. They each of them had taken responsibility for one element of the eightfold *pūjā*. They performed this *pūjā* with such intensity for a long period of time that they were reborn as gods.

### Appendix: Śrīcandrasūri's Description of the Funeral of Abhayadevasūri Maladhārīn

In his *praśasti* to the *Muṇisuvvayajīṇīṇḍacariya* Śrīcandrasūri describes the funeral of his teacher HM in an apparently perfunctory manner. The single verse he devotes to the event is as follows: *nīharaṇāimahimā dehassa taheva jāva sakkāro / kiṃ tu sayam eva rāyā samāgao kettiyaṃ vi pahaṃ* (v.10980). In fact, the wording of this verse shows that the reader is being referred for comparison to Śrīcandrasūri's earlier description of the funeral of Abhayadevasūri Maladhārīn which took place in 1121 / 1122.<sup>113</sup> A rendering of the first half of the verse would be: “The splendour of the carrying out etc. of (HM's) corpse was identical (*taheva*) (to Abhayadevasūri Maladhārīn's funeral) up to and including (*jāva*)<sup>114</sup> the cremation (*sakkāra*).” The second half of the verse signals the main difference between the two events: “on this occasion (*kiṃ tu*) the king (Jayasiṃha Siddharāja) came himself a little way along the path of the funeral procession.”

As I have pointed out elsewhere,<sup>115</sup> there is a dearth of textual material concerning the management of funerals in Jainism. Brief accounts of cremations of the Jinas no doubt do occur in the Śvetāmbara scriptures and the Digambara *purāṇas* and it might be possible to conclude that these idealised descriptions can be taken to represent general practice. However, first-hand accounts of actual funerals in early and medieval India, whether Jain or Buddhist and Hindu, seem to be extremely rare, not to say effectively non-existent,<sup>116</sup> and Śrīcandrasūri's unvarnished description of Abhayadevasūri's cremation, an event which he

<sup>113</sup> See Sāgarmal Jain, *Upadeśapuṣpamālā*, introduction p. 20. In this Appendix I give Abhayadevasūri Maladhārīn his full designation.

<sup>114</sup> This form signals an abbreviation of a lengthy stereotyped passage in Ardhamāgadhī canonical texts.

<sup>115</sup> Dundas 2011: 114.

<sup>116</sup> The description of the cremation of the Buddha in the Pāli *Mahāparanibbāṇa Sutta* is of course of prime importance but it hardly has eyewitness value. Similarly, the brief account of the funeral of Harṣa's father given by Bāṇa in his *Harṣacarita* (see Bakker 2007: 11f.) can, for all its conformity to brahmanical prescription, best be understood as having been filtered through the lens of *kāvya*.

witnessed personally (*paccakkhaṃ diṭṭhaṃ*), is therefore of some significance for the student of death ritual in South Asia. I give the Prakrit text of Śrīcandrasūri's account, followed by a translation and some overall observations.

Śrīcandrasūri, *Munisuvvayajinīmdacariya* vv. 10920-10932:

*bahubhūmigabahukalasaṃ anegasiyadhayavaḍehiṃ ramaṇijjaṃ |*  
*varasirikhaṃḍaviṇimmiyavimāṇaṃ ārohiṇaṃ tao || 10920*  
*nīhāriyaṃ sarīraṃ jassa bahi sayalamiliyasaṃghena |*  
*ekkekkaṃ giharakkhagamaṇuyaṃ mottūṇa sesajāṇo || 10921*  
*nīseso nivaṇayarassa niggao jassa daṃsaṇanimittaṃ |*  
*bhattīe kougeṇa ya maggesu aladdhasaṃcāro || 10922*  
*savvapamayāulehiṃ savvāujjehiṃ baṃdiviṃdehiṃ |*  
*savvehi viyaṃbhiyasaddavaharie aṃbarābhoe || 10923*  
*pāyārapacchimattālae thio pariyaṇena saha rāyā |*  
*jayasimho pekkhaṃto jassiddhiṃ nīharaṃtassa || 10924*  
*taṃ acchariyaṃ datṭhaṃ narīṃdapurisā paropparaṃ beṃti |*  
*maraṇaṃ aṇiṭṭhaṃ pi hu iṭṭhaṃ amha evaṃ vibhūte || 10925*  
*raviudayāo ārabba niggayaṃ taṃ vimāṇaṃ avaraṇhe |*  
*pattaṃ sakkārapae samaṇupayaṃ loyakayapūjaṃ || 10926*  
*pūjijante jammi u paṭṭaṃsuyapamuhaṇapavaraṇavatthāṇaṃ |*  
*miliyāiṃ koḍiyāṇaṃ tayā sayāiṃ aṇegāiṃ || 10927*  
*sirikhaṃḍavimāṇeṇaṃ (teṇeva) samaṃ sarīrasakkāro |*  
*jassa kao loṇaṃ taha uvāri puṇo vi khittāiṃ || 10928*  
*kaṭṭhāiṃ agarasirikhaṃḍasaṃtiyāiṃ ghaṇo ya ghaṇasāro |*  
*nivvāṇāe ciyāe jaṇena gahiyā tao rakkhā || 10929*  
*rakkhāe vi abhāve gahiyā taṭṭhāṇamaṭṭiyā tatto |*  
*tā jāva tattha jāyā jāṇupamāṇāviyaḍakhaḍḍā || 10930*  
*tīse rakkhāe maṭṭiyāe aṇubhāvao sirobāhā |*  
*velājaraegaṃtarajarāirogā paṇassaṃtā || 10931*  
*bhattivaseṇaṃ na maye maṇaṃ pi iha bhāsiyaṃ musā kiṃpi |*  
*jaṃ paccakkhaṃ diṭṭhaṃ tassa vi lesa imo bhaṇio || 10932*

“The entire Jain community (*saṃgha*) brought out the corpse<sup>117</sup> after lifting it onto a bier (*vimāna*) made from sandalwood (*sirikhaṃḍa*), with many auspicious pots on its various levels, resplendent with an abundance of white flags. All the other

<sup>117</sup> See Schopen 1997: 100-108 for observations on *sarīra* used in the sense of 'corpse' in an earlier Buddhist funerary context.

inhabitants of the capital<sup>118</sup> emerged to see it, with the exception of their domestic watchmen, blocking the streets in their devotion and curiosity.<sup>119</sup> The expanse of the heavens was deafened by the noise of all the dancing women, musical instruments and troops of bards. King Jayasiṃha and his attendants stood on the highest tower of the palace,<sup>120</sup> viewing the splendour of the cortege as it went forth. On seeing that extraordinary event (*acchariyaṃ*)<sup>121</sup> the king's men said to each other, 'Death may well be undesirable, but we are actually yearning for it now because of the glory<sup>122</sup> which attends it.' The bier went forth at sunrise and at midday reached the cremation site (*sakkārapae*), being worshipped by the crowds at every step of the way (*samaṇupayaṃ*). And as it was receiving this worship many hundreds of crores worth of fine clothing such as silk scarves (*paṭṭaṃsuya*) were thrown upon it. Then the corpse and the sandalwood bier were burnt along with them. The fuel for the funeral pyre consisted of aloe, sandalwood and thick camphor (*ghaṇasāra*). When the fire had burnt out, people then took the ashes (*rakkhā*) from it and all that was left was a clearly defined (*aviyaḍa*) pit (*khaḍḍā*) in the shape of Abhayadevasūri (*jāṇu*).<sup>123</sup> When the ashes had gone, they then took earth (*miṭṭiyā*) from that place<sup>124</sup> and through the application of the ashes and the

---

<sup>118</sup> The location of the funeral is Aṇahillapaṭṭana / Aṇahillapāṭaka, the Caulukya capital.

<sup>119</sup> This was not an event witnessed solely by Jains. At v. 10887 Śrīcandrasūri describes how in summer Abhayadevasūri was accustomed every third day to seek alms from the houses of non-Jains (*paḍhamaguṇaṭṭhāṇiya*).

<sup>120</sup> Or possibly the western wall of the palace. As noted above, Jayasiṃha temporarily joined HM's funeral procession rather than watching from a distance.

<sup>121</sup> The term *acchariya* ~ Sanskrit *āścarya* is commonly used in Śvetāmbara Jainism to signify an unprecedented event which takes place in the current debased period of time.

<sup>122</sup> There may be a pun on *vibhūt* (~ Sanskrit *vibhūti*) since the term can mean both 'glory, magnificence' and 'ashes'.

<sup>123</sup> The most obvious literal sense of *jāṇupamāṇa* is 'reaching to the knees' which might in these terms somehow relate to the posture of Abhayadevasūri Maladhārin's corpse on the funeral pyre. However, I would rather take *jāṇu* as an agentive form deriving from *jñā*, 'know', with the sense of 'scholar' or 'teacher'.

<sup>124</sup> Compare the very brief account of the aftermath of the (undescribed) funeral of Hemacandra Kalikālasarvajña in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutunga (early 14<sup>th</sup> century), p. 95 ll. 13-14: *tataḥ samastasāmantais tadānu nagaralokais tatrātyamṛtsnāyāṃ gr̥hyamānāyāṃ tatra hemakhaḍḍa ity adyāpi prasiddhiḥ*. ("Then all the vassals of King Kumārapāla and after them the city people took the earth from the place of cremation. It is still known today as Hemakhaḍḍā, 'Hemacandra's Cremation-pit'.") Tawney 1901: 150 n.4 proposes emending *hemakhaḍḍā* to *hemakhaṇḍa*, "Hema's part or portion".

earth headaches and fevers of varying durations were cured.<sup>125</sup> I have not been prompted by simple devotion to say anything in any way false; rather I have described just a part of what I myself saw.”

Recently Peter Flügel has offered in two important studies a radical reappraisal of the function of relics in Jain religious culture.<sup>126</sup> He draws attention to the fact that even if relic worship has not been fully rationalised by the tradition, the practice can be judged to have become near ubiquitous in contemporary Jainism where the notion of what is entailed by 'relic' has been extended to include not only the physical remains of cremated monks and nuns but also articles of clothing and possessions such as eye glasses.<sup>127</sup> Through inspecting the evidence of the early textual tradition Flügel explains Jain worship of what he styles 'sacred matter' as deriving from the belief that bodily parts and physical objects connected with cremated monks embody ascetic power which can be transferred by touch. This sacred matter is perceived to be constituted of karmic particles imbued with the innate energy of the soul and as the embodiment of asceticism it has the capacity to transmit this energy in the guise of healing power. In these terms the efficacy of physical relics for Jains derives from specifically material rather than metaphysical or symbolic properties. Flügel goes so far as to argue that the purpose of ascetic cremation in Jainism may have been to produce these relics.

In this light, two points are to be noted from Śrīcandrasūri's avowedly eyewitness description of Abhayadevasūri Maladhārin's cremation. Firstly, there is no suggestion that the dead teacher's physical relics in the form of bones or teeth were collected from the ashes of the funeral pyre for the purposes of commemoration or worship, let alone that some structure on the lines of a *stūpa* was constructed to house them as a future ritual focus. Secondly, it is clear that Abhayadevasūri Maladhārin's ashes, mingled as they were with the residue of the expensive substances used to cremate the teacher, were regarded as of primary worth for their curative properties and that the almost comically described descent of the spectators upon the post-cremation remains was to gain the dead monk's ashes and portions of the soil which had come into contact with them for the purposes of *rakṣā* (to use the Sanskrit term), magically

---

<sup>125</sup> See Meulenbeld 1974: 176 n.151 for *ekāntarīta* as a tertian fever and 178 n.155 for *velājvara* as a fever with a four day limit.

<sup>126</sup> Flügel 2010 and 2012.

<sup>127</sup> It has recently been inferred that, lack of archaeological and clear textual evidence notwithstanding, early Jainism must have had a relic cult on the grounds that there would otherwise have been no reason for the Jains to erect *stūpas*. See Bronkhorst 2011: 225-30.

protective substance.<sup>128</sup> The use of *rakṣā* was no doubt a regular component of the interplay of religion and healing in medieval India.<sup>129</sup> That a Jain monk such as HM might have viewed it as occasionally questionable can be deduced from a passage in the auto-commentary to his *Bhavabhāvanā* where in an allegorical narrative he describes a brahman ascetic, in fact a manifestation of Rāgakeśarin, 'Passion-Lion', concocting *rakṣā* to satisfy the gullible.<sup>130</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

*Abhidhānarājendrakōṣa* (Seven Volumes), Compiled by Vijayarājendrasūri. Ahmadāvād: Śrī Abhidhāna Rājendra Kōṣa Prakāśan Saṁsthā, 1986.

*Āvaśyakaniryukti* with Haribhadra's Commentary. Reprint of Āgamodya Samiti Edition. Bombay, 1981.

*Anuyogadvārasūtra* with the Commentaries of Haribhadra and Hemacandra Maladhārin. Edited by Muni Jambūvijaya. Mumbāi: Śrī Mahāvīrajainavidyālaya, 1999.

Bhadreśvara. *Kahāvali* (*paḍhamapariccheassa paḍhamo khaṇḍo*). Edited by Muni Kalyāṇakīrtivijaya. Ahmadābād: Kalikālasarvajña ŚrīHemacandrācārya Navama Janmaśatābdī Smṛti Saṁskāra Śikṣaṇanidhi, 2012.

*Bhagavatīsūtra*. *Bhagavaī Viyāhapaṇṇatti* (*Śataka-III-VII*). Edited by Ācārya Mahāprajña. Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bharati and Jain Vishva Bharati University, 2009.

Haribhadra. *Pañcavastuka*, Mumbāi: Jinaśāsana Ārādhana Trust, 1989.

---

<sup>128</sup> Compare Merutuṅga's description of Kumārapāla's use of Hemacandra Kalikālasarvajña's ashes at *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 95 ll. 12-13: *tadanantaram prabhoḥ saṁskārasthāne tad bhasma pavitram iti rājñā tilakavyājena namaś cakre* ("Thereupon King Kumārapāla paid his respects to the ashes at the site of Hemacandra's cremation by applying them as forehead-mark since they were regarded as being pure (*pavitra*)").

<sup>129</sup> Little research has been carried out into the use of *rakṣā* in Jainism. The rich primary literature in Buddhism surveyed by Skilling (1992) shows that the term refers to spells as well as substances.

<sup>130</sup> *Bhavabhāvanā* p. 310 l.2: *badhnāti ca rājñāḥ parijanasya ca kaṇḍakāni karoti rakṣāḥ pūrayati ca bhūripratayān*.

Haribhadra. *Upadeśapada* with Municandrasūri's Commentary. Bhuleśvar: Jinaśāsana Ārādhana Trust, 1990.

Hemacandra Maladhārin. *Bhavabhāvanā* with Auto-commentary. Ratlām: Ṛṣabhdev Keśarīmaljī Jain Śvetāmbara-saṁsthā, 1936.

Hemacandra Maladhārin, *Hāribhadrīyāvaśyakavṛttiṭippanaka*, Edited by Muni Kumudavijaya. Bombay: Sheth Devchand Lālbhāi Jain Pustakoddhāra Fund, 1920.

Hemacandra Maladhārin. *Puṣpamālāprakaraṇa*. Edited by Pradyumnasūri and Kāṁtibhāi B. Śāh. Ahmadāvād: Śrī Śrutjñān Prasāra Sabhā, 2003.

Hemacandra Maladhārin. *Upadeśamālā (Puṣpamālāparābhīdhā)* with Auto-commentary. Edited by Muni Ānandsāgara. Ratlām: Ṛṣabhdev Keśarīmaljī Jain Śvetāmbara-saṁsthā, 1936.

Hemacandra Maladhārin. *Upadeśapuṣpamālā*. Edited by Sāgarmal Jain. Jaypur / Śajāpur: Kuśal Jñān Sajjan Prakāśan / Prācyāvidyāpīṭh, 2007.

*Jaina Uddharaṇa Kośa*. Vol. 1. Edited by K.K. Jain. Delhi: Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology / Motilal Banarsidas, 2003.

Jinacandrasūri. *Samvegaraṁgaśālā*. Edited by Muni Hemendravijaya & Bābubhāi Savcaṁd. Mumbāpurī: Kāntilāl Maṇīlāl, 1969.

Jineśvarasūri. *Kathakoṣaparakaraṇa*. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Bombay: Singhi Jain Series 1949.

Jinadattasūri. *Upadeśarasāyanarāsa*. In: *Three Apabhraṁśa Works of Jinadattasūri*. Edited by Lalchandra Bhagawandas Gandhi, pp. 29-66. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1967.

Jinadattasūri. *Sandehadolāvalīprakaraṇa*. Jetaran: Sheth Chhaganlal Hirachandra, 1918.

Jinaprabhasūri. *Vividhatīrthakalpa*. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhi Jain Series 1934.

*Jīvasāmasaparakaraṇa* with Hemacandra Maladhārīn's Commentary. Edited by Śīlacandravijayaṇi. Khambāt: Śrī Jain Granth Prakāśan Samiti, 1994.

*Kalpasūtra*. In: *Jaina Sūtras. Part 1*. Translated by Hermann Jacobi, 217-311. Sacred Books of the East. Vol. 22. Edited by Max Müller. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1884.

*Manusmṛti. Manu's Code of Law*. Edited and Translated by Patrick Olivelle. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Merutuṅga. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. Edited by Muni Jinavijaya. Śāntiniketan: Singhi Jain Series, 1933.

Naracandrasūri. *Kathāratnasāgara*. Edited by Vijayamunicandrasūri. Surat: Ācārya Oṃkārasūri Ārādhana Bhavan, 2008.

*Piṇḍaniryukti*. See Bollée 1994.

Rājaśekharaśūri. *Śrīsūrimantranityakarma*. Edited by Muni Prītivijaya. Amadāvād, 1931.

Sādhusomagaṇin. *Laghuvṛtti* on Hemacandra Maladhārīn's *Puṣpamālā-prakaraṇa*. Edited by Buddhisāgaragaṇin. Muṃbaī: Mohanayaśaḥsmāraka Granthamālā, 1960 (unpaginated).

Saṅghadāsa. *Vasudevahiṇḍī*. Edited by Muni Caturavijaya & Muni Puṇyavijaya. Gāṃdhīnagar: Gujarāt Sāhitya Akādamī, 1989 (reprint).

Śāntisūri. *Dharmaratnaparakaraṇa* with Auto-commentary. Ahmadāvād: Jain Granth Prakāśak Sabhā, 1953.

Siddharṣi. *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcākathā*. Edited by Vijayajinendrasūri. Lākḥābāval: Harṣapuṣpāmṛta Jain Granthamālā, 1999.

Śivaśarmasūri. *Bandhaśatakaparākaraṇa* with the Commentaries of Cakreśasūri and Hemacandrasūri. Second Edition. Edited by Muni Vairāgyarativijaya & Muni Praśamarativijaya. Nāsik: Cintāmaṇi Pārśvanāth Mahārāj Jain Śvetāmbara Mūrtipūjaka Saṅgha, 2005.



Somadeva. *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Edited by Jagdīs Lāl Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1977.

Śrīcandrasūri. *Muṇisuvvayaḥiṇīṇḍacariyaṃ*. Edited by Rupendrakumāra Pagāriyā. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1986.

Vardhamānasūri. *Dharmaratnakaraṇḍaka*. Edited by Paṃnyās Municandravijayagaṇi. Ahmadābād: Śārādāben Cimanbhāi Ejyukeśanal Risarc Semṭar, 1994.

Vijayasimhasūri. *Bhuvāṇasumḍarīkahā*. Edited by Vijayaśīlacandrasūri. Ahmadāvād: Paṇḍit Dalsukh Mālavaṇiyā Prākṛt Granth Pariṣad, 2000.

## Secondary Sources

Alsdorf, Ludwig. “Zwei Proben der Volksdichtung aus dem alten Magadha.” *Kleine Schriften: Nachtragsband*, 777-784. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998.

Bakker, Hans. “Monuments to the Dead in Ancient North India.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50 (2007) 11-47.

Balbir, Nalini. “Stories from the Āvaśyaka Commentaries.” *The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories: A Treasury of Jain Literature*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 17-74. Oakville: Press, 1990.

Balbir, Nalini. *Āvaśyaka-Studien: Introduction générale et traductions*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993.

Balbir, Nalini et al. *Somadeva: Océan des rivières de contes*. Paris: Gallimard 1997.

Bollée, Willem B. *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa- and Oha-nijjuttis of the Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition*. Volume 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994.

Bollée, Willem B. *The Story of Paesi (Paesi-kahāṇayaṃ). Soul and Body in Ancient India: A Dialogue on Materialism*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.

Bollée, Willem B. “‘Adda’ or the Oldest Extant Dispute between Jains and Heretics (Sūyagaḍa 2, 6): Part One.” Edited by M.A. Dhaky & J.B.Shah, 48-84. *Jambū-jyoti (Munivara Jambūvijaya Festschrift)*. Ahmedabad: Shreshti Kasturbahi Lalbhai Smaraka Nidhi, 2004.

Bollée, Willem B. *Gone to the Dogs in Ancient India*. München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. *Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism*. Leiden and Boston: E.J. Brill, 2011.

Brown, W. Norman. *The Story of Kālaka*. Washington: The Smithsonian Institution, 1933.

Bühler, Georg. *The Life of Hemacandrācārya*. Ahmedabad and Calcutta: Singhi Jain Series, 1931.

*Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library*. Edited by Nalini Balbir, Kanhaiyalal V. Sheth, Kalpana K. Sheth & Chandrabhal Bh. Tripathi. London: The British Library and the Institute of Jainology, 2006.

Caudharī, Gulābchand. *Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*, Vol. 6. Vārāṇasī: Pārśvanāth Vidyāśram Śodh Saṁsthān, 1973

Chojnacki, Christine. “Remodelling Jain Novels in the 13th.C.” Paper delivered at the 2011 SOAS Jaina Studies Workshop on Jaina Narratives.

Chojnacki, Christine. *Vividhatīrthakalpaḥ. Regards sur le lieu saint jaina*. Tome 1-2. Institut Français de Pondichéry, 1995.

Cort, John. E. “The Jain Sacred Cosmos: Selections from a Medieval Pilgrimage Text.” *The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories: A Treasury of Jain Literature*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff, 245-290. Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1990.

Cort, John E. “Who is a King? Jain Narratives of Kingship in Medieval Western India.” *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*. Edited by John E. Cort, 85-110. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Cort, John E. “The Intellectual Formation of a Jain Monk: A Śvetāmbara Monastic Curriculum.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 21 (2001) 327-349.

Cort, John E. “How Jains Know what They Know: A Lay Jain Curriculum.” *Jambū-jyoti (Munivara Jambūvijaya Festschrift)*. Edited by M.A. Dhaky & J.B. Shah, 399-413. Ahmedabad: Śhresthi Kasturbai Lalbhai Smarak Nidhi, 2004.

Deleu, Jozef. *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaī). The Fifth Aṅga of the Jaina Canon*. Brugge: De Tempel, 1970.

Devendra, Muni. *Jain Jagat ke Jyotirdhar Ācārya*. Udaypur: Śrī Tārak Guru Jain Granthālaya, 1985.

Dhaky, M.A. *Studies in Nirgrantha Art and Architecture*. Ahmedabad: Sambodhi Sansthan, 2012.

Dhaky, M.A & U.S. Moorti. *The Temples in Kumbhāriyā*. New Delhi and Ahmedabad: American Institute of Indian Studies and Labhai Dalpatbhai Institute of Indology, 2001.

Dundas, Paul. “The Digambara Jain Warrior.” *The Assembly of Listeners: Jains in Society*. Edited by Michael Carrithers and Caroline Humphrey, 169-186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Dundas, Paul. “The Jain Monk Jinapati Sūri Gets the Better of a Nāth Yogī.” *Tantra in Practice*. Edited by David Gordon White, 231-238. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Dundas, Paul. *The Jains*. Second Edition. New York and London: Routledge, 2002.

Dundas, Paul. “Haribhadra's Lalitavistarā and the Legend of Siddharṣi's Conversion to Buddhism.” *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Edited by Olle Qvarnström, 151-166. Fremont: Asian Humanities Press, 2003.

Dundas, Paul. *History, Scripture and Controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect*. New York and London: Routledge, 2007.

Dundas, Paul. "Sthūlabhadra's Lodgings: Sexual Restraint in Jainism." *Celibacy and Religious Traditions*. Edited by Carl Olson, 181-199. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Dundas, Paul. "The Uses of Narrative: Jineśvara Sūri's Kathākoṣaprakaraṇa as Polemical Text." Edited by Colette Caillat & Nalini Balbir. *Jaina Studies*, 101-115. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2008.

Dundas, Paul. "Textual Authority in Ritual Procedure: The Śvetāmbara Jain Controversy Concerning Īryāpathikipratikaramaṇa." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 39 (2011) 327-350.

Dundas, Paul. "A Digambara Jain Saṃskāra in the Early Seventeenth Century: Lay Funerary Ritual According to Somasenabhaṭṭāraka's Traivarṇikācāra." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 54 (2011) 99-147.

Emmrich, Christoph. "Śvetāmbaras, Digambaras und die Geschichte ihres Kanons als Besitz, Verlust und Erfindung." *Kanonisierung und Kanonbildung in der asiatischen Religionsgeschichte*. Edited by Max Deeg, Oliver Freiberger & Christoph Kleine, 105-129. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2011.

Flügel, Peter. "The Jaina Cult of Relic Stūpas." *Numen* 57, 3 (2010) 389-504.

Flügel, Peter. "Sacred Matter: Reflections on the Relationship of Karmic and Natural Causality in Jaina Philosophy." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40, 2 (2012) 119-176.

Granoff, Phyllis. "Jinaprabhasūri and Jinadattasūri: Two Studies from the Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition." *Speaking of Monks: Religious Biography in India and China*. Edited by Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, 1-96. Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1992.

Horster, Marietta & Christiane Reitz (ed.). *Condensing Texts-Condensed Texts*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 2010.

Jain, Jagdish Chandra. "The Adaptation of Viṣṇu-Bali Legend by Jaina Writers." *Journal of the Oriental Institute Baroda* 29 (1980) 209-215.

Jain, Kailash Chand. *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1972.

Johnson, Helen M. “The Story of the Thief Rauhiṇeya in the Mahāvīracarita of Hemacandra.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 44 (1924) 1-10.

Jyväsjarvi, Mari. “*Parivrājikā* and *Pravrajitā*: Categories of Ascetic Women in Dharmaśāstra and Vinaya Commentaries.” *Indologica Taurinensia* 33 (2007) 73-92.

Kāpaḍiyā, Hīrālāl Rasikdās. *Jain Saṃskṛt Sāhityano Itihās*, Vol. 3. Sūrat: Ācārya Śrī Oṃkārsūri Jñān Mandir, 2004.

Kelting, M. Whitney. *Heroic Wives: Rituals, Stories, and the Virtues of Jain Wifehood*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Kermode, Frank. *Pleasure and Change: The Aesthetics of Canon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Koch, Rolf-Heinrich. *Die Namaskāra-vyākhyā der Āvaśyaka-Tradition*. Dissertation, München 1990.

Koch, Rolf Heinrich. “On The Interrelation of Certain Prakrit Sources.” *Indologica Taurinensia* 35 (2009) 275-286.

Krause, Charlotte. *German Jain Śrāvikā Dr. Charlotte Krause: Her Life and Literature Vol. 1*. Varanasi: Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha, 1999.

Kulkarni, Vaman Mahadeo. *The Story of Rāma in Jain Literature*. Ahmedabad: Sarasvati Pustak Bhandar, 1990.

Kulkarni, Vaman Mahadeo. *Studies in Jain Literature*. Ahmedabad: Shresthi Kasturbia Lalbhai Smaraka Nidhi, 2001.

Kulkarni, Vaman Mahadeo (ed.). *A Treasury of Jain Tales*. Ahmedabad: Sharadaben Chimanbhai Educational Research Centre, 1994.

Lavani, B.K. et al. (ed.). *People of India: Rajasthan*. Volume 38, Part 2. Mumbai: Popular Prakashan, 1998.

Leumann, Ernst. *An Outline of the Āvaśyaka Literature*. Translated by Gerd Baumann. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 2010 (Original: *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*. Herausgegeben von Walther Schubing. Hamburg, 1934).

Leumann, Ernst. *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Nalini Balbir. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998.

Lopez, Donald S. "Sanctification on the Bodhisattva Path." *Sainthood: Its Manifestations in World Religions*. Edited by Richard Kieckhefer & George D. Bond, 172-217. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Mehtā, Mohanlāl. *Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*. Vol. 3. Vārāṇasī: Pārśvanāth Vidyāśram Śodh Saṁsthān 1989.

Mehtā, Mohanlāl & Hīrālāl R. Kāpaḍiyā. *Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*. Vol. 4. Vārāṇasī: Pārśvanāth Vidyāśram Śodh Saṁsthān, 1968.

Mehta, Mohan Lal & K. Rishabh Chandra. *Prakrit Proper Names*. Part 1. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1970.

Mehta, Mohan Lal & K. Rishabh Chandra. *Prakrit Proper Names*. Part 2. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1972.

Mette, Adelheid. "The Tales Belonging to the Namaskāra-vyākhyā of the Āvaśyaka-Cūrṇi." *Indologica Taurinensia* 11 (1983) 129-144.

Mette, Adelheid. *Die Erlösungslehre der Jaina. Legenden, Parabeln, Erzählungen*. Berlin: Insel Verlag, 2010.

Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan. *The Mādhavanidāna and its Chief Commentary, Chapters 1-10*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

Nagarajaiah, Hampa. *Stories of Abhayakumāra*. Krishnapuradoddi: K.S. Muddappa Smaraka Trust, 2008.

Oberlies, Thomas. “Die Erzählungen von Kāmpilya-König Brahmadatta: Eine Untersuchung im Anschluss an Vorarbeiten von Ernst Leumann.” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 9-10 (1997) 259-313.

Oberlies, Thomas. “König Śibi bei den Jainas: Das *Śāntināthacarita*.” *Pāsādikadānam: Festschrift for Bhikkhu Pāsādika*. Edited by M. Straube et al., 303-322. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2009.

Schopen, Gregory. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

Schubring, Walther. *Die Jaina-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1944.

Schubring, Walther. *Nāyādharmakahāṇo: Das sechste Anga des Jain-Siddhānta*. Wiesbaden: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, 1978.

Sheth, Hargovind Dās T. *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo*. Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society, 1963.

Singh, K. *India's Communities H-M: Vol. 5. Anthropological Survey of India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Skilling, Peter. “The *Rakṣā* Literature of the Śrāvakayāna.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 27 (1992) 109-182.

Smith, John D. *The Mahābhārata*. London: Penguin Books, 2009.

Tawney, Charles Henry. *The Kathākoṣa or Treasury of Stories*. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1895.

Tawney, Charles Henry. *The Prabandhacintāmaṇi or Wishing Stone of Narratives Composed by Merutuṅga Ācārya*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1901.

Tawney, Charles Henry (& N. M. Penzer). *Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara (The Ocean of Story)*. Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1880/1968.

Tessitori, L. P. *Studi giainici*. Udine: Società Indologica 'Luigi Pio Tessitori', 1912/2000.

Tripāṭhī, Chandrabhāl. *Catalogue of the Jaina Manuscripts at Strasbourg*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Tripuṭī Mahārāj. *Jain Paramparāno Itihās*, Vol. 2. Amadāvād: Cāritra Smārak Granthamālā, 1960.

Vinayasāgar. *Kharatara Gaccha Sāhitya Kośa*. Jaypur: Prākṛit Bhāratī Akādamī, 2006.

Wiles, Royce. The Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhandha and its Commentary by Śrīcandra: Critical Edition, Translation and Notes. Ph.D. Thesis, Australian National University, 2000.

Williams, R. *Two Prakrit Versions of the Maṇipati-Carita*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society, 1959.

Wright, J. Clifford. “The Supplement to Ludwig Alsdorf's *Kleine Schriften*: A Review Article.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 62 (1999) 529-542.